1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
2	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
3	DEPARTMENT 28 HON. YVETTE M. PALAZUELOS, JUDGE		
4			
5	PICO NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION, ) ET AL.,		
6	PLAINTIFFS, )		
7	VS. ) CASE NO. BC616804		
8	CITY OF SANTA MONICA, ET AL., )		
9	DEFENDANTS. )		
10	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS		
11	TRIAL		
12	TUESDAY, AUGUST 28, 2018		
13	A.M. SESSION		
14	APPEARANCES:		
15	FOR PLAINTIFFS: SHENKMAN & HUGHES, PC		
16	BY: KEVIN SHENKMAN, ESQ. ANDREA A. ALARCON, ESQ.		
17	28905 WIGHT ROAD MALIBU, CALIFORNIA 90265		
18	kishenkman@shenkmanhughes.com		
19	PARRIS LAW BY: R. REX PARRIS, ESQ.		
20	ELLERY S. GORDON, ESQ. RUTGER R. PARRIS, ESQ.		
21	43364 10TH STREET WEST LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA 93534		
22	LAW OFFICES OF MILTON C. GRIMES		
23	BY: MILTON C. GRIMES, ESQ. 3774 WEST 54TH STREET		
24	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90043 miltgrim@aol.com		
25	(CONTINUED)		
26	PAGES 2896 TO 2976		
<ul><li>27</li><li>28</li></ul>	REPORTED BY: RHONA S. REDDIX, CSR RPR CRR RMR NO. 10807 OFFICIAL REPORTER		

1	APPEARANCES:	
2	(CONTINUED)	
3	,	
4	FOR PLAINTIFFS:	LAW OFFICE OF ROBERT RUBIN
5		BY: ROBERT RUBIN, ESQ. 131 STEUART STREET, SUITE 300
6		SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105 robertrubinsf@gmail.com
7	FOR DEFENDANT CITY OF SANTA MONICA:	
8	SANIA MONICA:	BY: MARCELLUS MC RAE, ESQ. TIAUNIA HENRY, ESQ. KAHN A. SCOLNICK, ESQ.
9		MICHELE L. MARYOTT, ESQ. DANIEL R. ADLER, ESQ.
10		MARISSA MOSHELL, ESQ. MIGUEL LOZA, JR., ESQ.
11		SEAN S. TWOMEY, ESQ. 333 SOUTH GRAND AVENUE
12		LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071 thenry@gibsondunn.com
13		CITY OF SANTA MONICA
14 15		CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE BY: GEORGE S. CARDONA, ESQ. 1685 MAIN STREET, 3RD FLOOR
16		SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA 90401 george.cardona@smgov.net
17		g
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27 28		
∠ ర		

1		<u>I</u> <u>N</u> <u>D</u> <u>E</u> <u>X</u>
2	8/28/18, A.M. SE	ESSION
3	PLAINTIFFS' WITN	NESSES <u>DIRECT</u> <u>CROSS</u> <u>REDIRECT</u> <u>RECROSS</u>
4	PROFESSOR JUSTIN	N LEVITT 2914
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		EXHIBITS
10	NUMBER	FOR IDENTIFICATION IN EVIDENCE
11	206	2968
12	208	2947
13	295	2917
14	295-1	2918
15	295-2 to -4	2919
16	322	2950
17	323	2962
18	324	2971
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1	CASE NUMBER:	BC616804
2		PICO VS SANTA MONICA
3	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA	TUESDAY, AUGUST 28, 2018
4	DEPARTMENT 28	HON. YVETTE M. PALAZUELOS
5	REPORTER:	RHONA S. REDDIX, CSR 10807
6	TIME:	A.M. SESSION
7	APPEARANCES:	(SEE TITLE PAGE.)
8		
9		
10	THE COURT: Pico Neighb	oorhood Association versus
11	City of Santa Monica, BC61680	04. Good morning.
12		
13	(Respon	ses.)
14		
15	THE COURT: Counsel, ma	ake your appearances.
16	MR. RUBIN: Robert Rubi	n on behalf of Plaintiffs.
17	Good morning, Your Honor.	
18	MR. SHENKMAN: Good mor	rning. Kevin Shenkman also
19	for Plaintiffs.	
20	MS. ALARCON: Good morr	ning, Your Honor. Andrea
21	Alarcon for the plaintiffs.	
22	MR. GORDON: Ellery Gor	rdon on behalf of
23	Plaintiffs.	
24	MR. GRIMES: Good morni	ng, Your Honor.
25	Milton Grimes on behalf of Pl	aintiff.
26	MR. MCRAE: Marcellus M	Mc Rae, Gibson, Dunn and
27	Crutcher, appearing on behalf	of City of Santa Monica.
28	MR. SCOLNICK: Kahn Sco	olnick on behalf of the City

```
1
     of Santa Monica.
           MS. HENRY: And Tiaunia Henry on behalf of City of
 2
 3
     Santa Monica.
           THE COURT: Thank you. Everyone be seated.
 4
 5
           MR. MCRAE: Thank you, Your Honor.
           THE COURT: Let me ask Defendants, you filed a
 6
 7
     Revised Motion for Sanctions; right?
           MR. SCOLNICK: We did, Your Honor.
 9
           THE COURT: Was that on August 20th or is that the
10
     original one?
           MR. SCOLNICK:
11
                          I believe that was August 20th.
12
     calculated the ten-day response dated the 30th, the
13
     Plaintiffs' response; so it would have been the 20th we
     filed.
14
15
           THE COURT: Okay. And do we have a response yet?
16
                          It's due the 30th.
           MR. SCOLNICK:
17
           THE COURT: Oh, right, right. Okay. So we got to
18
     hold on to that. Okay. That's still up.
19
                  Anything else to talk about before we
20
     start?
21
           MR. SCOLNICK: We have three issues, Your Honor.
22
           THE COURT: All right.
23
          MR. SCOLNICK: First, sorry to be bringing this up
24
     again, but the designations.
25
           THE COURT: Okay.
26
           MR. SCOLNICK: Last night we learned of a 180 by
27
     plaintiffs, but let me just walk you through it and I
28
     think we can resolve it without too much of a fight I
```

hope.

So you'll recall that Plaintiff designated all the council members by depositions only?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SCOLNICK: The first day of trial we talked about the process where each side would designate each part, Your Honor would rule we claim one time. We went through a number of fits and starts, but eventually we got them to Your Honor, and the Court ruled. And as of last Friday we were told that we would have all the videos by Saturday; we'd be able to review them so the plaintiffs could play them and we'd be done with them.

Saturday we got no videos. We asked them. They said they were having technical difficulties. Eventually we got one video, but yesterday they told us they were taking issue with all of our designations, saying they were hearsay and outside the scope of what's designated.

So that's where we are right now. We have a proposal, if Your Honor --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SCOLNICK: Our proposal is that we're done fighting about this. We think that this is just a side show. It's petty. It doesn't advance the case. We think if they want to revisit what we can play, we're willing to — unless Your Honor prevents them from doing it, we're willing to let them revisit it. We'll meet and confer with them. We've been here for a month. We

don't that there's a case, and these videos aren't going to change anything.

So what we propose is we go back to the drawing board with the videos. We -- in good faith, we review the City's designations, which Your Honor's already ruled on, and if we can find some that are not truly within the scope of completeness, we will pull them out and so the plaintiffs can play whatever videos they want.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, remember part of my thinking on that with allowing it is that they weren't preservation videos, which means you were thinking at the time when they were taken that you wouldn't have an opportunity to call them, which is why I gave a lot leeway to that.

MR. SCOLNICK: I understand. And we're not trying to snatch defeat from jaws of victory, Your Honor, but we're just trying to avoid a fight on this.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SCOLNICK: And, again, if they have a hearsay objection — and we think it's been waived because they didn't make a hearsay objection but — we would propose doing that in good faith. Now, that would mean there's no videos to play today. Plaintiffs represented to us that they wanted to finish today.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SCOLNICK: But there will be no videos. We would redo that.

In the meantime, we have a witness, Dr. Lichtman, who, as you know, is coming out here. He'll be here tomorrow to testify --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SCOLNICK: -- tomorrow and Thursday. And then some subset of our mutual teams can work this out so hopefully by Friday we have some agreement on what the clips are. That's what we propose.

And then finally, Your Honor, I would just point out that this has wasted a lot of our time and a lot of the Court's time, and we'll address that at the end of the trial.

MR. SHENKMAN: Your Honor, if I may perhaps give a little bit of background about what we encountered very recently, in fact, over the weekend.

If Your Honor may recall, we took the deposition of Tony Vazquez while the trial was going on, and we provided our designations to defense counsel for that deposition. I think it was a total of three or four designations, very discrete. I think it may have been the only point that we were trying to make with those designations is that Mr. Vazquez is almost certain to win the State Board of Equalization race and, therefore, come December he will no longer be on the Santa Monica city council.

What we got back is not anything -- they want to play these many other portions where Mr. Vazquez is pontificating about what he thinks, what remedy,

1 whether it would be effective or not, and, I mean, it's unqualified expert opinion, but more importantly it has 2 nothing to do with what plaintiffs are designated --3 4 designating. 5 And if I may direct the Court to People versus Gambos (phonetic), 1975, Cal.App.3rd [sic] 187, 6 7 in particular at 192, 193, it discusses the rule of 8 completeness and Evidence Code 356. THE COURT: I understand the rule of completeness. 9 Did you not hear what I said about the fact that these 10 11 designations were not preservation videos? 12 MR. SHENKMAN: Sure. 13 THE COURT: So you wouldn't be expected to examine 14 on everything and present just in response to your 15 designation; so they should be allowed to designate other areas --16 17 MR. SHENKMAN: So --THE COURT: -- unless you're going to call him 18 19 live. 20 MR. SHENKMAN: Well, so I think it's -- because 21 it's a party opponent, it's Plaintiffs' right to play 22 certain portions that they wish from the deposition. If 23 defendant then wants to call that witness live, 24 that's --25 THE COURT: Well, we had this discussion already. 26 That wasn't going to happen. We were going to do all

through video. You weren't going to do partially the

deposition on video and partially live. We were going

27

28

```
1
    to do one or the other, is I believe the discussion we
2
    had.
3
          MR. SHENKMAN: Okay. Well, I'm sorry I
4
    misunderstood.
5
          THE COURT: All right.
          MR. SHENKMAN: So we'll move on, I suppose.
6
7
          MR. SCOLNICK: And like I said, as far as Tony
8
    Vazquez, this recent one, we will go back to what we
9
    designated, and if we need to pull some back in good
    faith, we'll do that so we can just get on with this.
10
11
          MR. SHENKMAN: Your Honor, if that's the case, we
    may want to just play volume one of Mr. Vazquez, and
12
13
    we'll -- you know, we'll -- won't waste any more of the
14
    Court's time with any video. If they want to call those
15
    folks live, then we can deal with the deposition; if
    not, then we'll just rest our case after Professor
16
17
    Levitt.
          THE COURT: So your solution is to just call them
18
19
    live?
20
          MR. SHENKMAN: Well, we won't call them live in
21
    our case in chief. I don't think it's necessary. I
22
    think at this point be a waste of time. But, of course,
23
    defendant is free to call them live if they'd like in
24
    their case.
25
          THE COURT: Then why play any video at all?
26
          MR. SHENKMAN: That may be where we end up, Your
27
    Honor.
28
          THE COURT: Okay. That's a lot of wasted time all
```

right.

MR. SCOLNICK: Lot of wasted time. I can't tell them what to put on, Your Honor. If they're going to call anyone in their case, it's only by designation. If we call someone in our case, they can cross-examine them, but that's just how it's got to work.

MR. SHENKMAN: Yeah. And I have no idea what witnesses defendant is going to call because their witness list is, you know, I think a lot larger than what they're actually planning to call. So maybe we just wait and see.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHENKMAN: Try to keep --

THE COURT: Perhaps in rebuttal, I mean, you can call them live if they don't call them.

MR. SCOLNICK: I mean, again, they had a plan.

They had a witness list. They said what they were going to do. I think if I -- what I'm hearing now is the only video they're going to play is Tony Vazquez, volume one, that's been cut. We have the designations for him.

We're okay with that video. If that's it, then Plaintiffs can rest today after Mr. Levitt's done. We can play -- I think it's a 35-minute video.

MR. SHENKMAN: Yeah. And I apologize for any waste of the Court's time. I don't think it helps to then waste more of the Court's time with playing I think what would amount to maybe eight to ten hours' worth of video, is what it ended up being; so that's what I'm

1 trying to avoid. THE COURT: Okay. So we're going to hear from 2 Levitt today and then the video depositions at some 3 other time possibly or just live testimony? 4 5 MR. SHENKMAN: I think we'll just do Vazquez, 6 volume one, if that's acceptable to Defendant, and we'll 7 move on. 8 MR. SCOLNICK: It's their case, Your Honor. 9 Whatever they want to play. 10 THE COURT: And that one is done, Vazquez. 11 MR. SCOLNICK: That one is done and we're okay 12 with it. 13 THE COURT: Okay. 14 MR. SCOLNICK: That's it. 15 And we also want to address the proffer this morning with respect to Ms. McDonald. We submitted 16 17 it. If it's satisfactory to the Court, we would like to get that order and then make our proffer. 18 19 THE COURT: Okay. Were there any responses? I 20 didn't see any. 21 MR. SHENKMAN: Your Honor, I'm not sure that it 22 required a written response. I can certainly respond 23 now if that's okay with the Court. 24 THE COURT: All right. 25 MR. SHENKMAN: You know, reading through it, 26 it's -- the vast majority of it reads like a motion for 27 reconsideration, and then the last part is -- there's 28 four questions that they -- the Defendant apparently is

okay answering.

And what they ask for is that that not be -- that answering those four questions not itself constitute a waiver, sort of like a use immunity kind of thing, and we're fine with that.

But I don't know that those four questions are all of the questions that need to be asked in order to deal with the issue of privilege, and so that's --

THE COURT: But what are the other questions you think need to be asked?

MR. SHENKMAN: So starting with the first question, whether the City retained Ms. McDonald as a consulting expert, I don't think it should be limited to just as a consulting expert, and it needs to also include her company, Q2 Data Research.

And then in addition to the questions that they ask here, I think it's appropriate to ask, did she prepare a report or presentation? What was the subject of that report or presentation? Who was the report or presentation communicated to? Did she communicate her findings? If so, to whom and when? And was the report or findings confidential? And what measures were taken to ensure its confidentiality?

MR. SCOLNICK: Your Honor, these questions are so far invading the work product protection and the privilege that we would object. I mean, we've sort of bent over backwards to give everyone what I thought we needed in terms of just the foundation to determine

whether Ms. Mc Donald was a consulting expert and, if so, whether she'd be covered by the work product protection and any conversation to be covered by privilege.

But this -- we're going further. Assuming all that is established, we're going to go further in establishing what she did, who she talked to. These are questions that she would not have to answer.

So basically, again, the law requires, as Your Honor cited, a foundation for determining whether there is work product protection. The questions that we have agreed to answer would establish that if they're answering affirmatively. Anything further is absolutely protected, and it's invading the work product protection, and it's frankly completely unnecessary for what Plaintiffs purport to be trying to accomplish here, which is just identifying whether Ms. Mc Donald was a consultant and whether it be covered by the work product protection.

MR. SHENKMAN: Your Honor, every one of the questions that I just mentioned has to do with either confidentiality of the communication, which is a requirement for privilege, or who was it communicated to, from, and whether it exists. None of those questions go to the content of the report, the content of the study, only the to, from, subject, and confidentiality.

THE COURT: Well, isn't that what they said they

1 would do? MR. SHENKMAN: Well, Your Honor --2 THE COURT: To, from, date, I think is what they 3 4 also agreed to provide. 5 MR. SHENKMAN: If that was the case, then I don't think we would have a dispute here, but I don't think 6 7 that the four questions that they propose answering fully covers that. 9 MR. RUBIN: Subject matter. THE COURT: Okay. Read them again. Read what 10 11 they agreed to present. 12 MR. SHENKMAN: They have here, A., whether it, the 13 City, retained Ms. Mc Donald as a consulting expert; if 14 so, when Ms. Mc Donald was retained; if so, who retained 15 Ms. Mc Donald; and, if so, for what purpose Ms. Mc Donald was retained. 16 17 THE COURT: Okay. MR. SHENKMAN: So I don't think that covers, you 18 19 know, whether a report or presentation exists and who it 20 was communicated to, if anyone, and it doesn't deal with 21 the confidentiality of that report or study. 22 THE COURT: Well, isn't that the natural result of 23 their relationship? 24 It could be, except in this MR. SHENKMAN: 25 particular instance this information is out there, that 26 this report occurred, Ms. Mc Donald's name is in the 27 newspaper. So, you know, if they didn't take --28 THE COURT: What do you mean the information is

1 out there? MR. SHENKMAN: Well, two Santa Monica newspapers 2 3 reported that the study that was raised in this courtroom was actually done by Ms. Mc Donald. And so 4 5 whatever steps -- I don't know if they took any steps to keep this report confidential, but it seems that --6 7 well, it certainly isn't confidential anymore, and so 8 then the next question is did they take steps to 9 maintain --THE COURT: Well, the report -- did they have a 10 11 copy of the report? Then it wouldn't be confidential. 12 But if they don't, I don't see how the fact that they 13 think there's a report makes it not privileged or work 14 product. 15 MR. SHENKMAN: Yeah. I believe the newspapers say that they got that information from the City, so... 16 17 THE COURT: What? What did they get from the City? That there's a report? 18 19 MR. SHENKMAN: That there's a report and it was 20 done by Karin Mc Donald. 21 THE COURT: Well, how does that somehow vitiate 22 or -- vitiate the privilege? 23 MR. SHENKMAN: It may not, as long as Defendant 24 took steps -- reasonable steps to maintain the 25 confidentiality. 26 MR. SCOLNICK: What could we learn from Ms. Mc

Donald about that? I mean, this would be like me

finding out that Plaintiffs hired a consulting expert

27

28

and the expert did a report and then all of a sudden I claim that I get to call the expert in and ask questions about what he or she did.

Again, let's go back to where we started, Your Honor, which is we need a factual basis to determine whether what Ms. Mc Donald did or didn't do would be protected by the work product protection and attorney-client privilege. The questions we suggested would get us there.

These other ventures are just far outside what is needed to make that factual determination. It's just a fishing expedition that would get further and further away from the factual foundation we made a proffer for.

MR. SHENKMAN: Your Honor, I mean, certainly even if the Court says, you know, the confidentiality, we don't need to address that, there's still the to, from, who it was communicated to, because it's not, as defense counsel states, the same as if Plaintiffs had a consulting expert that — they didn't like the report so they didn't use that expert.

This is a government body, a city that, you know, has in the past, in '92, demonstrated an intent to discriminate, as was argued before. If, in fact, this report was presented to the City and the City then took no action, that bears on the intent issue.

The only other thing that I would add, Your Honor, I understand that the person that the City would

have answer these questions is Mr. Cardona. My understanding is that Mr. Cardona joined the City of Santa Monica's attorney's office in 2018; so he may not himself have personal knowledge of Ms. Mc Donald's retention and work.

MR. SCOLNICK: Well, Mr. Cardona is able to provide factual foundation. He can talk to people. He knows what's going on. He has communications. And so he's going to make a satisfactory, factual foundation, if Your Honor lets him do that, under the conditions we've outlined.

So, again, this is all just kind of a detour. We need to stick with what we proffered. If Your Honor wants to know -- I mean, let -- we can -- Mr. Cardona can make the proffer, and if it turns out that there was a consulting arrangement, Your Honor wants to know whether the information was communicated to the city council in closed session, he would be willing to make that proffer, too.

That does not get -- that does not get -- again, it doesn't get into what the report was, whether there was a report. And all these questions are just farther and farther outside what we are willing to proffer as just a basic factual foundation and all that's required for the protection we're trying to establish.

THE COURT: So what is the one additional thing that you said could be answered, whether communications

```
1
    were made in closed session?
2
          MR. SCOLNICK: In closed session to the city
3
    council, by the City attorney.
4
          THE COURT: Okay. Yes, I think that's sufficient.
          MR. SHENKMAN: Your Honor, as long as we get
5
6
    the -- whether a report or presentation existed, made
7
    when it was communicated with the council, and the
8
    subject matter of it, that's fine.
9
          MR. SCOLNICK: No, Your Honor. Whether a report
    was done is not fine. Plaintiffs -- I showed you the
10
11
    letter. Plaintiffs agreed we do not need to produce a
    consulting expert report. We don't need to log it. We
12
13
    don't need to produce it. That's not what we agreed to
14
    in this case. It's not unnecessary.
15
          MR. SHENKMAN: I think the Court's order on this
16
    matter was clear. The existence of the report, as
17
    opposed to its content, the existence is not privileged,
    and so it should be required to say, yes, it exists and
18
19
    the subject matter.
2.0
          THE COURT: I'm satisfied with --
21
          MR. SCOLNICK: Thank you.
22
          THE COURT: -- this proffer.
23
          MR. SCOLNICK:
                          Thank you.
24
          THE COURT: So you want to make a proffer?
25
          MR. SCOLNICK: Are we good on the order?
26
          THE COURT: Yes.
27
          MR. SCOLNICK: Okay.
          THE COURT: It's fine. So everything -- in
28
```

addition, communications, whether it's a report or whatever the communication is, was done in closed session is what --

MR. SCOLNICK: Thank you.

MR. CARDONA: Good morning, Your Honor. George Cardona from the Santa Monica city attorney's office.

As Mr. Shenkman has noted, I was not in the office at the time. However, I have reviewed records in the city attorney's office and reviewed communications between the people who were in the office at the time.

The information is this: The City attorney for the City of Santa Monica retained Ms. Mc Donald through her company, which Mr. Shenkman has named, Q2 Data and Research, LLC, which is her company, retained her as a consulting expert.

That retention occurred after the complaint in this case was filed. The complaint in this case was filed on April 12th, 2016. The retention occurred shortly after that, on or about April 18th, 2016. She was retained by the City Attorney's Office for the purpose of assessing the allegations in the complaint and being in a position to provide legal advice to the city council about that.

There was work done by Ms. Mc Donald. That work was provided to the City Attorney's Office, which retained it in confidence. That work was discussed with the city council in closed session, the expectation that it would remain in confidence, and the City Attorney's

```
Office has retained that work in confidence, maintaining
1
2
    its confidentiality.
3
          THE COURT: Okay. It's been in confidence ever
    since?
4
5
          MR. CARDONA: That is our understanding, yes.
          THE COURT: Okay. All right. It seems to me this
6
7
    is privileged. If you want to discuss it further, you
    can, but I think we're done.
          MR. SHENKMAN: The only thing that I would ask is
9
10
    whether a report was done, whether it existed. And I
11
    think beyond that --
12
          THE COURT: I think they said she did provide
13
    work. It was discussed in closed session. It's been
14
    maintained in confidence since. At that point, it was
15
    communicated in confidence and it's been maintained ever
    since. I think that's sufficient.
16
17
          MR. SHENKMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
          MR. SCOLNICK: Thank you, Your Honor.
18
19
          THE COURT: Thank you.
                 Okay. Do we have Mr. Levitt?
20
21
          MR. MCRAE: Yes.
          MR. SHENKMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
22
23
          MR. MCRAE: Your Honor, I'll be right back.
24
          THE COURT: Okay.
25
          THE WITNESS: Good morning, Your Honor.
26
          THE COURT: Good morning. Have a seat. You don't
27
    need to be resworn as long as you can tell me you
28
    understand you're still under oath.
```

```
1
           THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor.
           THE COURT: Let's wait for Mr. -- forgot his name.
 2
 3
           MS. HENRY: McRae.
 4
           THE COURT: -- Mr. McRae to come back.
 5
           THE WITNESS: Of course.
 6
 7
                   (PAUSE IN THE PROCEEDINGS.)
 8
 9
           THE COURT: Okay. We can get started.
10
           MR. SHENKMAN:
                          Thank you.
11
12
                 DIRECT EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)
13
     BY MR. SHENKMAN:
14
           Q.
                  Professor Levitt, when we sort of abruptly
15
     ended on Friday, we were talking about the available
     remedies in this case. Do you recall that?
16
17
           Α.
                  I do.
18
                  Okay. And just to recap a little bit, we
           Q.
19
     were talking about how districts are the most common
20
     remedy. Do you recall that?
21
                  Yes.
           Α.
22
                  Okay. And could you -- I think maybe we
23
     were interrupted mid answer on this, but I believe you
24
     were describing the features that make districts the
25
     most common remedy. Do you recall that?
26
           Α.
                  Yes.
27
                 Okay. Can you describe what features those
28
     are for us, please?
```

A. Of course. So I believe when we left off I was discussing why it was that districts are the most common remedy for dilution. The most straightforward reason is that they're familiar. Members of the public understand how to vote for candidates and districts.

That's how we vote for members of Congress, for members of the state legislature. In many cities and many other counties, that's how we vote for county supervisors, and so in many areas those are common; so people understand them.

Not coincidentally, those also happen to be methods of election that voting systems are able to accommodate quite easily; so most of the candidates on any given citizen's ballot will be elected from single member districts, and so the voting systems are sort of built naturally to accommodate that. That's not to say that others can't be accommodated, but districts are very easy to implement using available — the actual machines used to cast and count ballots.

Districts are also particularly useful or particularly powerful when most of or much of the community of interest is concentrated in an geographic area or when there are specific differences in the organization of the community in a particular geographic area. So if one part of the minority community is localized and/or organized but other parts are not, districts may help give that community voice in a way that an at-large structure would not.

And the final reason that it's most common is particularly when there's a socioeconomic difference between the community of interest, between the minority community and the surrounding area, districts can help accommodate or can help alleviate some of the campaign finance disparities.

So in a citywide election you have to attempt to reach every voter or a large portion of voters. You have to worry about a jurisdiction-wide getting out the information. And in districts that's simply a smaller number of people or a smaller geographic area to talk to, it means that you can effectively run a campaign with less money, having to raise less money, needing less money and support.

- Q. Okay. Are you aware of how much money is typically spent in Santa Monica city council elections?
  - A. I am.
- Q. Okay. Let's pull up Exhibit 295, please.

  Okay. And, Professor Levitt, could you describe what this document shows?
- A. This is a spreadsheet or the results of a spreadsheet, prepared at my direction, summarizing the campaign finance filing statements from the California F.P.P.C., the Fair Political Practices Commission.

```
(Exhibit Number 295, identified:
1
                   Summary of campaign finance filing
2
3
                   statements for Santa Monica
                   elections.)
 4
5
          MS. HENRY: Your Honor, may we have a copy of this
6
7
    exhibit? I don't think I've seen it before.
    objection to lack of foundation.
           MR. SHENKMAN: Your Honor, I think he was
9
    describing the source of this information --
10
11
           THE COURT: Okay. Let's get the foundation then.
12
           MR. SHENKMAN: -- as the F.P.P.C.
          MS. HENRY: Thank you.
13
14
           THE WITNESS: Yeah, this is summary of the
15
     individual campaign finance filings of candidates for
    Santa Monica city council, Santa Monica school board,
16
17
     Santa Monica College board, Santa Monica Rent Control.
           THE COURT: You saying the filings, are you
18
19
    referring to public filings?
20
           THE WITNESS: Public filings, yes, ma'am. They
21
    are -- in every election that -- for which are campaign
22
     finance filing requirements, candidates will have to
23
     file. Also, organizations that are supporting or
24
    opposing those candidates will have to file, delineating
25
    their expenses, their receipts taken in, their expenses
26
    put out.
27
                  The -- these -- the summary that I asked
28
     for referred to the elections in 2004 in Santa Monica,
```

```
1
     in 2012, and in 2016. And this is -- it's simply a
 2
     summary of contributions and expenditures for the
     various entities weighing in in those elections; so
 3
     candidates and the entities supporting them for each of
 4
 5
     those four types of contests.
           THE COURT: It doesn't tell us what year, though.
 6
 7
     I don't think you typed those. Or does it?
 8
           THE WITNESS: I don't know that the chart does,
     but the candidates -- so I don't know if the chart
 9
     itself does, but the candidates are the same candidates
10
     that will be referenced in Dr. Lewis's work and in
11
12
     Dr. Kousser's, and I can identify them for the Court if
13
     that's useful.
14
           THE COURT: Maybe that's a good idea.
15
     BY MR. SHENKMAN:
                Okay. So on the first page, is this for
16
           0.
     2004 city -- 2004 elections?
17
18
                  Yes.
           Α.
19
20
                  (Exhibit Number 295-1, identified:
21
                   Re 2004 elections.)
22
     BY MR. SHENKMAN:
23
24
                  Okay. And the numbers up at the top, are
           0.
25
     those the totals?
26
                  Those are the total amounts, either
27
     contributions received or expenditures spent on behalf
     of the candidates. That's correct.
28
```

```
1
                Okay. And let's go to 295, Page 5, please.
           Q.
           THE COURT: Is this still 2004?
 2
          MR. SHENKMAN: This next section is going to be
 3
 4
     2012, Your Honor.
 5
           THE COURT: Okay. The next page is 2012?
           MR. SHENKMAN: 295, starting at Page 5 is 2012.
 6
 7
           THE WITNESS: May be helpful, Your Honor, Pages 1
 8
     through 4, I believe, correspond to the 2004 election --
 9
           THE COURT: Okay.
           THE WITNESS: -- including school board candidates
10
11
     and rent control.
12
13
                  (Exhibit Number 295-2 TO 295-4,
14
                   identified: Re 2004 elections.)
15
           THE WITNESS: Starting with 2005 [sic], it's the
16
17
     2012 election. And then I'm not sure about the page
18
     numbers, but it might be helpful to delineate 2016.
          MR. SHENKMAN: Your Honor, I believe 2016 starts
19
20
     on Page 8 of the document.
21
           THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
22
23
                  (Exhibit Number 295-8, identified:
24
                  Re 2016 elections.)
25
26
          MS. HENRY: Your Honor, may I also ask for a point
27
     of clarification? On Page 5 here, this is the 2012
28
     election? I guess the number at the top, across from
```

```
1
    the name Davis, is that her complete personal --
2
           THE WITNESS: Sorry.
3
           MS. HENRY: I don't -- that doesn't appear to be
4
    accurate to me.
           THE WITNESS: Gleam Davis's total -- maybe it
5
    might help to explain what it is Your Honor is looking
6
7
    at, and this might help with counsel.
8
                  On Page 5 in particular, you can see that
9
    the total amount spent in the city council race is
     $970,136 overall. That's not from Ms. Davis alone.
10
11
    total amount either which Ms. Davis raised or spent on
12
    her behalf is the highlighted number, 187,041.61. So
13
    that's the total amount either she raised or was spent
14
    on her behalf. And if you add each of the highlighted
15
    yellow totals, you'll arrive at the 970,000 for the city
    council race in total.
16
17
                  And similarly, if you add all of the green
    highlighted cells, you'll arrive at the school board
18
19
    total. If you add all of the blue highlighted cells,
20
    you'll arrive at the rent control total.
21
           THE COURT: It's just a little confusing because
    it's on the Gleam Davis line, so...
22
23
           THE WITNESS: Yes, I can understand counsel's
24
    confusion.
25
           THE COURT: Right.
26
           MR. SHENKMAN: Is it clear now, Your Honor?
27
           THE COURT: Yes.
28
          MR. SHENKMAN: Okay. Thank you.
```

## 1 BY MR. SHENKMAN: And so at the top of Page 5, those are the 2 totals for each of those elections? 3 In the 2012 election, there was a total of 4 Α. 5 \$970,000 and change spent on the city council race, yes. Okay. Let's go to Page 8, please. 6 Q. 7 And the top line, highlighted, beginning 8 with 403,000 and change for city council, are those the 9 totals for the 2016 election? Yes. On Page 8, yes. 10 11 Q. Okay. So we've seen -- I think the first 12 one was 600,000 and --THE COURT: What does N.F. stand for? 13 14 THE WITNESS: Not found. So I understand that 15 there were certain totals that were either sufficiently small or were not sufficiently reported or that were 16 17 otherwise not able to be located. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 18 19 BY MR. SHENKMAN: 20 Q. Okay. So we've looked at these three 21 elections and the city council total spending being 600,000 and change, 970,000, and 403,000 and change. 22 23 In your experience, is that a large amount 24 of money to be spent on a city council race in a city 25 the size of Santa Monica? 26 Α. It is. 27 MS. HENRY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague and lack

of foundation.

28

THE COURT: Sustained. Lack of foundation. 1 MS. HENRY: I move to strike the answer. 2 3 THE COURT: Granted. The answer is stricken. 4 BY MR. SHENKMAN: 5 Q. Okay. So, Professor Levitt, have you had an opportunity to study the amounts spent in city 6 7 council races in California in cities of similar size to Santa Monica? 9 MS. HENRY: Objection, Your Honor. The amount of money spent in city council elections in other 10 jurisdictions, those other than Santa Monica, are not 11 12 relevant in this case. What is relevant and at issue 13 here is whether or not Latino voting power is being 14 diluted in Santa Monica elections. And it's vague. 15 THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer. THE WITNESS: I have, both in California and 16 17 outside of California. 18 BY MR. SHENKMAN: 19 Okay. And based on that study, do you have Q. 20 an opinion as to whether the amount spent in 21 Santa Monica city council elections is on the high side 22 or low side of what you've seen in other cities the size of Santa Monica? 23 24 I do. Α. 25 What is that opinion? Q. 26 It's large. It's quite a bit larger than 27 average for a city the size of Santa Monica. In cities 28 that are roughly 20,000 people, you might expect about

\$10,000 to be spent on a city council race and it scales up from there.

That's not to say there are individual races that are certainly -- where people spend less.

There are individual races where people spend more. But to have -- for a city the size of Santa Monica, about 60,000 registered voters, to have \$900,000 spent, almost a million dollars spent in a city council race, that's quite a bit. You see totals like that on each candidate's side in a congressional race. That's unusual in a city council.

- Q. And how large is a congressional district?
- A. A congressional district is between 700,000 and 800,000 people.

The more usual amounts of money spent are what you see here. And, again, it varies, but what you see here in the school board and college board elections may be a little bit higher than some of the years represented, a little bit lower than some of the years represented. But the city council number is consistently higher than many other cities, not all other cities, but many other cities Santa Monica's size.

- Q. Okay. How does the -- how, if at all, does the amount of money spent in Santa Monica city council elections impact your opinion about the effectiveness of districts in Santa Monica?
- A. The amount of money spent in Santa Monica makes it difficult to run and win city-wide,

particularly for a minority with -- of lower socioeconomic status across the jurisdiction. Districts would help alleviate that to some degree. So in a city-wide election you generally need to reach at least half of all of the voters and that can be an expensive proposition.

In addition, you have to reach the voters in a way that gets the message through. And as this table shows, individual candidates raised between -- many of them -- there are some stark anomalies -- between 30 and \$60,000.

But there's a significant independent expenditure component to each of these elections, and particularly if you're fighting against the prevailing organizations that are spending independently, it's going to take even more money to get the message out if you don't have a similar independent expenditure organization weighing in on your side.

In a district scenario, it's possible to walk the streets more economically. You can have volunteers who are willing to walk the streets, rather than needing to pay canvassers. Generally, the amount of money that you'll spend to reach each voter is the same, but the number of voters is less and so costs should drop dramatically. In order to mail something to every household, you have to reach fewer households than you would if you were mailing city-wide.

Q. Thank you.

Have you had an opportunity -- an occasion to evaluate the pattern in election performance among cities that have switched from a at-large system to a district system as a result of voting rights litigation?

- A. I have, generally.
- Q. And what have you found in that study?
- A. I found --

MS. HENRY: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance. In other jurisdictions, whether they've switched to a different election — method of election or not is not relevant to whether or not a different, an alternate method of election will alleviate any, if any, voting dilution in Santa Monica. There are different demographics in different jurisdictions, different populations of minority groups, different minority groups at issue, and none of those are analogous to the City of Santa Monica.

MR. SHENKMAN: Well, Your Honor, I think

Defendant's counsel exaggerates the differences between

Santa Monica and other places. Santa Monica is not

unique. It's a Southern California city.

What I'm attempting to do is lay the foundation for Professor Levitt's opinions about whether districts would be an effective remedy in Santa Monica and part of that is a comparison of what we've seen elsewhere.

If Your Honor recalls, in the cities -- in excluding us from putting on the live testimony of

Sergio Farias and Juan Carrillo in particular, the Court's response was, well, just have Justin Levitt provided.

THE COURT: Those were citizens, right, from other districts like Palmdale and somewhere else?

MR. SHENKMAN: Those were city council members.

THE COURT: Oh, city council members.

MR. SHENKMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

MS. HENRY: Your Honor, in addition to being irrelevant because those jurisdictions do not have the same demographics as Santa Monica and cannot translate their change in the method of election to Santa Monica, it's also speculation as to what would happen in the City of Santa Monica. And he lacks foundation to speak to those facts in another jurisdiction in which he doesn't reside.

And then the -- oh, yes. And the Court never said that Mr. Levitt could provide the testimony of those other witnesses but, rather, that he could provide an opinion about what method of election he believes should operate in the City of Santa Monica.

MR. SHENKMAN: And that's exactly what he's doing.

MS. HENRY: No, Your Honor. Respectfully, he's opining about what's going on in a different jurisdiction, with different demographics, different minority populations at issue, and how they have or have not switched to a different method of election, not what he believes should be operating in the City of Santa

1 Monica.
2 THE CO

was?

THE COURT: Well, he needs some foundation for that, for that opinion. So where does he look? He has to look to other places in order to lay that foundation. So I'll overrule the objection.

You may answer.

MS. HENRY: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. SHENKMAN: Do you recall what the question

10 THE WITNESS: I don't. I apologize, Counsel.
11 BY MR. SHENKMAN:

Q. So I'll try to do my best to ask the same question.

What have you found in studying those other jurisdictions that have gone from at-large to district-based elections as a result of litigation?

A. I found that they generally provide more opportunity to the minority population that triggered the litigation; that the extent of that opportunity obviously differs by jurisdiction.

It is true that there are different demographics, different levels of organization, different levels of turnout, different socioeconomics in each jurisdiction, but there has been a pattern or trend of more opportunity, and occasionally you see that in the election results.

Q. Okay. Let's talk about a couple of those jurisdictions in Southern California. Okay?

```
1
                  Are you familiar with the City of Palmdale?
                  I am.
2
           Α.
3
                 Okay. And I think you previously testified
           Q.
    that --
4
          MS. HENRY: Your Honor, sorry to interrupt. May I
5
     just have a continuing objection on this line of
6
7
    questioning?
8
           THE COURT: Can we get a jurisdiction that's
     similar to Santa Monica? Because not sure Palmdale is
9
    similar. So I'll sustain it as to Palmdale.
10
11
          MR. SHENKMAN: Okay.
12
          THE COURT: Unless you can lay that foundation
13
    with Palmdale.
14
          MS. HENRY: Thank you.
15
          MR. SHENKMAN: I think in many respects Palmdale
    is similar to Santa Monica and in other respects it's
16
17
    not.
18
           THE COURT: Counsel, you're not the witness. You
19
    need to get that through the witness.
20
          MR. SHENKMAN:
                          Sure.
21
    BY MR. SHENKMAN:
22
                  Okay. You said you're familiar with the
           Q.
    City of Palmdale?
23
24
           Α.
                  I am.
25
                  I believe earlier you said that you
26
    actually testified in the California Voting Rights Act
27
    case against the City of Palmdale; correct?
28
                  I did.
          Α.
```

Q. Do you recall the approximate population of the City of Palmdale?

- A. I don't recall the global size of the City of Palmdale. I know the demographics of the individual districts that were created, but I don't recall the overall size.
- Q. Okay. And what about the demographics of the individual districts? Do you recall?
- A. I remember in particular that there was one district that was created that, in that case, happened to be majority citizen voting age population Latino. I believe it also had a bare majority of registered voters who were Latino. And the election in -- I'm sorry. Forgive me.

The registered voters in Palmdale were not actually majority Latino. They were --

- Q. And that's in that particular district?
- A. In that particular district, yeah. Sorry. The jurisdiction as a whole, Latinos were neither majority of the citizen voting age population nor a majority of the registered voters.

The district was drawn in particular to respond to concerns under the California Voting Rights Act. That district had a majority -- bare majority of Latino voting age population, had a substantial portion of Latino registered voters, and I believe in the first election after the districts were drawn, that that district actually elected a Latino candidate, Mr. Juan

Carrillo.

MS. HENRY: Your Honor, I would move to strike and renew my objection to this line of questioning as to the City of Palmdale.

As we heard from other experts in this case, the best district that can be drawn in the City of Santa Monica is 30 percent C-VAP. And Mr. Levitt has just testified that in the City of Palmdale the district that was drawn was majority C-VAP, which is above 50 percent.

Moreover, the City of Palmdale is three times the size of the City of Santa Monica in terms of Latino voting population. And for those reasons I would move to strike the last answer as irrelevant.

MR. SHENKMAN: Well, Your Honor, I think the next city that I'd like to ask the witness about I think is probably closer to Santa Monica than Palmdale, but there's never going to be any city that's identical.

THE COURT: Sure, I understand that. I'm going to sustain the objection with respect to Palmdale, but you can ask about this other city.

MS. HENRY: Thank you.

## BY MR. SHENKMAN:

- Q. Let's talk about San Juan Capistrano, okay?

  Are you familiar with the City of San Juan Capistrano?
  - A. I am.
- Q. And did San Juan Capistrano at some point switch from at-large elections to district elections?

```
A. It did.
```

- Q. Was that in response to litigation?
- A. It was.
- Q. All right. When San Juan Capistrano drew its districts, were there any districts that were a majority citizen voting age population Latino?
  - A. No.
- Q. Okay. And in the district election held by San Juan Capistrano, in those districts what occurred?
  - A. I'm sorry?
    - MS. HENRY: Objection.
- MR. SHENKMAN: I'll withdraw the question. It was probably vague so that's --
- MS. HENRY: Well, I just would object again on relevance and lack of foundation. He hasn't established that the majority -- or the district at issue in that case is analogous here. As I understand it, the City of San Juan Capistrano had a district that was 44 percent Latino voting age population in the district at issue.

And here again, Mr. Ely and Dr. Morrison have testified that the best district that's possible is 30 percent, which is not analogous to the City of Santa Monica; and, therefore, I would object on relevance.

MR. SHENKMAN: Well, Your Honor, not to be picky, it is a little bit over 30 percent, but the point is that it's not a majority Latino. And, you know, I don't know that we're going to get the exact percentage. We have the data that we have and that's a 43 percent

```
1
     district in San Juan Capistrano, not a Latino majority
2
     district, and how that performed is certainly relevant
3
     here.
           THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to overrule the
4
5
     objection.
           MS. HENRY: Thank you, Your Honor.
6
7
     BY MR. SHENKMAN:
8
           Q.
                  Has San Juan Capistrano held a district
9
     election?
                  Yes.
10
           Α.
11
           Q.
                  How many?
12
                  I believe it's held one. I believe another
           Α.
13
     is coming.
14
           Q.
                  And that one was in 2016; correct?
15
           Α.
                  Correct.
                  And what was the -- in your understanding,
16
           Ο.
17
     what was the largest proportion Latino district in San
18
     Juan Capistrano?
19
           Α.
                  I believe that the district in question,
20
     the district of the highest proportion of Latino
21
     minorities, was 44 percent Latino citizen voting age
22
    population. I believe that the registered voter
23
     population was somewhere in the 20s.
24
                  In the 20s?
           Ο.
25
                  I believe it was about 22 percent
26
     registered voter population --
27
                  Okay. And --
           Q.
28
                  -- who were of Latino descent.
           Α.
```

```
1
                  Okay. And who prevailed in that district
           0.
2
     in 2016 that was 44 percent Latino C-VAP but only 20
     something percent Spanish surname registration?
3
                  Sergio Farias prevailed. He's now the
4
           Α.
5
     mayor of San Juan Capistrano.
                  Okay. And did Mr. Farias run in any
6
           Q.
7
     previous at-large elections?
                  I believe that he did.
                  Okay. And what was the result in -- do you
9
           Ο.
     recall when he ran in that previous at-large election?
10
11
                  I believe it was shortly before the 2016
12
     election, but I can't say exactly when.
13
                  And what was the result when Mr. Farias ran
           Ο.
14
     in the at-large system?
15
                  He lost.
           Α.
                  So he lost in the at-large system and then
16
           Ο.
17
     won in the district system?
18
                  Correct.
           Α.
19
           Q.
                  Thank you.
20
                  Are you familiar with the City of Highland?
21
           Α.
                  I am.
22
                  And the City of Highland also switched from
           Q.
23
     at-large to district elections; is that correct?
24
                  It did.
           Α.
25
                  And how many election cycles has Highland
26
     had in that district system?
27
           MS. HENRY: Objection, Your Honor. Lack of
28
     foundation. We haven't established that the City of
```

```
1
     Highland is analogous to the City of Santa Monica based
2
     on C-VAP district --
3
           THE COURT: Okay. Sustained. A little more
     foundation.
4
          MS. HENRY: Thank you, Your Honor.
5
     BY MR. SHENKMAN:
6
7
                 Okay. The City of Highland adopted a
           0.
8
     district election system; correct?
                  It did.
9
           Α.
                  Okay. And are you familiar with the
10
           Ο.
11
     demographics of those districts?
12
                  I am, some.
           Α.
13
                  Could you describe demographics in terms of
           Q.
14
     Latino proportions of those districts?
15
                  At least one of the districts was majority
     Latino citizen voting age population. I believe there
16
17
     was a second district that was drawn that was not
     majority Latino citizen voting age population.
18
19
           MS. HENRY: Your Honor, I would move to -- well,
20
     not to strike the last answer.
21
                  Your Honor, I object on relevance to this
22
     line of questioning because the City of Highland, as
23
     Mr. Levitt has just testified, has a majority Latino
24
     population -- citizen voting age population district,
25
     which we've heard from Mr. Ely and Dr. Morrison is not
26
     possible in the City of Santa Monica. The best possible
27
     district is 30 percent C-VAP.
28
          MR. SHENKMAN: Your Honor, I think if you'll allow
```

me little bit of leeway, where I'm going with this is how the district that was not a Latino majority district performed in Highland.

MS. HENRY: Your Honor, just further objection on that district. He hasn't elicited -- Plaintiffs' counsel hasn't elicited from Mr. Levitt what size the second district in the City of Highland was.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's get there.
BY MR. SHENKMAN:

- Q. Okay. What proportion Latino citizen voting age population is that non-Latino majority district that you mentioned?
- A. I believe it's in the 40s, but I'm not entirely sure where in the 40s.

MS. HENRY: Your Honor, I would renew my objection as to relevance. We don't know whether it was 49 percent, 48 percent. And to the extent it is as close to 50 percent as that, it's not relevant to or analogous to a district that can be drawn in the City of Santa Monica, which is only 30 percent at best.

MR. SHENKMAN: Your Honor, the point that they made on the summary judgment motion, and I believe a motion in limine that was essentially won for nonsuit, is that if you can't draw a Latino majority district, you lose.

And what I'm trying to elicit from this witness is that districts, even when there is not a Latino majority, even under C-VAP, that they have been

effective in other places.

And, you know, for example, in San Juan Capistrano the registered voter pool in that district may even be lower than what we have in Santa Monica. You know, in Santa Monica Latinos are registered at a much higher rate than in San Juan Capistrano, and, you know, if we need to, we can discuss all the reasons why that is the case.

But, you know, if you're going to look somewhere, you got to look at the, you know, relatively discrete body of cities that have gone from an at-large to a district-based election system in Southern California and how they performed.

MS. HENRY: Your Honor, respectfully, Plaintiffs' counsel has misrepresented our argument. But regardless, what is relevant here is what's happening in the City of Santa Monica and whether a remedy of a district-based method of election would alleviate the alleged dilution that Mr. Levitt and Plaintiffs' counsel contends is occurring there.

And to the extent they are analogizing to different jurisdictions that do not have the same demographics as the City of Santa Monica, and where one can create a majority or near majority C-VAP citizen voting age population Latino district, those jurisdictions are not analogous to the City of Santa Monica and say nothing about whether any such district will be effective in the City of Santa Monica, which is

```
1
     why they are irrelevant.
2
           THE COURT: Overruled.
3
           MS. HENRY: Thank you, Your Honor.
     BY MR. SHENKMAN:
4
5
           Q.
                  I forgot what the question was.
           THE COURT: It was 40 percent C-VAP.
6
7
           THE WITNESS: Yes.
           THE COURT: And he wasn't sure where in the
8
9
     40 percent range it fell, I think is where we left off.
           THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
10
     BY MR. SHENKMAN:
11
12
                  Okay. And in 2016, what was result of the
           Q.
13
     district election in that non-Latino majority district?
14
           Α.
                  The Latino candidate prevailed.
15
                  Okay. And are you familiar with the
           Q.
     election history in the City of Highland?
16
17
           Α.
                  Yes.
                  Okay. Prior to 2016, had any Latino been
18
           Q.
     elected to the city council of Highland?
19
                  I don't believe so.
20
           Α.
21
                  Are you familiar with the City of Anaheim?
           Q.
22
           Α.
                  Yes.
23
           0.
                  And Anaheim switched from at-large to
24
     district elections; is that correct?
25
           Α.
                  Yes.
26
           Q.
                  Okay. Was there a -- was there a district
27
     that had the majority Latinos in that city?
28
           Α.
                  There was.
```

```
1
           Q.
                  Okay.
                  After -- after the switch, naturally.
 2
 3
     Anaheim is not itself majority Latino.
           MS. HENRY: Your Honor, I would just object.
 4
 5
     Again, renew my objection to this line of questioning as
     to the City of Anaheim, where you can create a majority
 6
 7
     Latino district, which is not possible in the City of
 8
     Santa Monica, where the best possible district is
 9
     30 percent.
           MR. SHENKMAN: Your Honor, if the Court's rule on
10
11
     this issue is we can talk about places where it's not a
12
     Latino majority, Anaheim would not fall under that, and
13
     if that is in fact what the Court wants to hear about,
14
     is only situations where it's not a Latino majority,
15
     then I'll move on.
           THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to sustain the
16
17
     objection.
18
           MS. HENRY: Thank you, Your Honor.
     BY MR. SHENKMAN:
19
20
           Q.
                  Let's pull up Exhibit 261, please.
21
                  Professor Levitt, are you familiar with
     Exhibit 261?
22
23
           Α.
                  Yes.
24
                  What is it?
           Ο.
25
                  I believe that it's an exemplary map. It's
26
     one potential map of certainly the City of Santa Monica
27
     that I'm familiar with. I believe this is a map that
```

Mr. Ely prepared showing seven potential districts

within the City.

- Q. Okay. And are you familiar with the demographics of these districts?
  - A. Roughly.
  - Q. Okay. Let's go to Exhibit 262, please.

And, Professor Levitt, is it your understanding that this table describes demographics of the various districts from Mr. Ely's seven-district plan?

A. Yes, with the caveat that I believe that those percentages are taken from a survey done over the years 2011 to 2016, and so they represent the demographic range over that period.

Given growth patterns in the minority population as compared to growth patterns in the rest of the population, it's likely but uncertain that the Latino population is larger. Where the Latino population is situated is likely that there are -- is a greater percentage of Latinos now. But this is, as I understand it, Mr. Ely's calculations, given the data that we have.

Q. Okay.

THE COURT: Can I ask you a question? Is there a gentrification in Santa Monica? What we call "gentrification"?

THE WITNESS: There -- there is gentrification across L.A. County generally, and so also in Santa Monica. My understanding is that the affordable

housing in Santa Monica is concentrated in particular neighborhoods. Those tend to be -- the neighborhood most affected tends to be the Pico Neighborhood most under discussion here.

And so there hasn't been -- my understanding is there's not been the same dispersion of the Latino population that -- the population with lower socioeconomic status. There's not been the dispersion around the City that you might expect with gentrification elsewhere.

THE COURT: I just wonder if there's some kind of offset to the increase in the growth with gentrification, families leaving the area.

THE WITNESS: My understanding is there's little place for them to go, particularly if they want to stay within Santa Monica.

THE COURT: Okay.

BY MR. SHENKMAN:

- Q. Have you seen a -- any trend in terms of the Latino proportion of Santa Monica over the years?
- A. It's growing and it is it is growing unsurprisingly reflecting general trends among the Latino population in California, it's growing at a rate that's faster than proportionally than other populations in Santa Monica.
- Q. Okay. And that's notwithstanding the gentrification that is going on in Santa Monica and elsewhere?

A. It -- it is growing even -- it is growing on net, even considering the effects of gentrification, yes.

Q. Okay. Thank you.

And is there anything in this table that affects your opinion about the effectiveness of Mr. Ely's seven-district plan?

A. There's certainly data that's relevant to the effectiveness. The 30 percent — voting age population, 30 percent, citizen voting age population, 30.4 here, potentially a little bit more, potentially a little bit less, is within the zone of what the Supreme Court has generally called an "influence district." So it provides an opportunity for that population to substantially affect the outcome of an election.

MS. HENRY: Objection, Your Honor. Move to strike that last statement about what the Supreme Court has ruled as an influence district. As we've previously objected, this witness is not able to provide opinions about legal standards and what the law provides.

MR. SHENKMAN: I don't think his comment was about what the law provides. I think his remark was simply an understanding of the phrase "influence district," and he's providing his understanding and his usage of that phrase.

THE COURT: Okay. Overruled.

THE WITNESS: So the 30 percent is generally within a zone of a substantial population, a large

population able to substantially influence the election of a candidate of choice.

BY MR. SHENKMAN:

Q. Okay. And you mentioned the phrase "influence district." Could you provide a little bit of an explanation about what you mean by that?

MS. HENRY: Objection, Your Honor. It's to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion. This witness, again, is an expert in methods of election but not able to opine on what the legal standards are for an influence district.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: So an influence district is merely a district in which a target population, a minority population of interest, has the ability to substantially affect the outcome of the election, even if they're not solely in the driver's seat alone. So it's a community that candidates feel they need to respond to. They can swing the outcome of an election even if they are not solely able to drive the result simply by their own turnout.

## BY MR. SHENKMAN:

- Q. Did you consider the Latino citizen voting age population of districts other than district one?
- A. I did. I would say that each of the districts, at least in this plan, other than district one, provides a population, and that population will have some impact on the election. But I would not call

1 those populations large enough to substantially 2 influence the result of the election. 3 Q. Okay. And those populations in districts two 4 Α. 5 through seven, certainly no voter can be ignored but they're not -- they're not in any sort of driver's seat 6 7 with the result of an election typically. 8 THE COURT: Talking about other non-White 9 populations? THE WITNESS: Sorry. The -- I understood the 10 11 question to be about the Latino population in 12 particular. 13 THE COURT: Okay. 14 THE WITNESS: But it would also be the case for --15 for any of the other non-White populations in particular, and I don't think I've seen evidence 16 17 indicating that those other populations vote 18 consistently together with enough regularity to make 19 them an affecting voting bloc together. 20 So I wouldn't -- without further evidence, 21 I wouldn't just assume that the African-American 22 community and the Asian community vote together as one 23 bloc. None of the other Latino populations are 24 sufficiently sizable to really substantially influence 25 an election in that district. 26 BY MR. SHENKMAN: 27 Okay. In district number one, the Ο. 28 non-Hispanic White citizen voting age population,

according to this table, is 45 percent. Do you see that?

A. I do.

- Q. Is that important to your opinion about the effectiveness of this district plan?
- A. It means that the non-Hispanic White population is not a majority of the district. I would expect that they would win some elections, in fact, many elections, but I would expect that the Latino electorate would have the opportunity to influence the decision of the remaining voters.

That is, I expect a substantial Latino turnout in District One would be able to swing an election perhaps among candidates favored by the non-Hispanic White majority, but that the non-Hispanic White majority would not as a bloc be able to win every single election.

- Q. Okay. Is it fair to say that at 30 percent or 31 percent the Latino proportion has more influence than at 13.6 percent?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And what is the Latino citizen voting age population of the City of Santa Monica as a whole?
- A. As I understand, again, with the same caveats about the numbers, that they arrive -- I believe these are Dr. Morrison's numbers -- they arrive from a survey over five years. I believe it's approximately

1 13.2 percent. 2 Okay. And --Q. 3 Α. 4 Ο.

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

- Of citizen voting age population.
- And in district two, the Latino citizen voting age population is 13.9 percent. Do you see that?
  - I do. Α.
  - And in District Seven it's 13.5 percent? Ο.
- 8 Α. I do.
  - All right. So those are both right around Ο. the -- the proportion in the City as a whole?
  - Yeah. And in those districts I would Α. expect Latinos to similarly have a lack of electoral success. Looking at those demographics, without a lot more information, I would be very skeptical of a chance of Latino success in winning elections in those districts, as -- as in the City of Santa Monica.
  - So it's the same in those districts as it is currently in the City of Santa Monica?
    - Α. Roughly.
  - Ο. Did you consider the organization of Latinos within the Pico Neighborhood in forming your opinions?
- I did. 23 Α.
  - Is there anything in particular that you looked at in terms of that organization?
- There was. So it's important in assessing 26 27 whether districts are an appropriate remedy to consider 28 not only the demographics but the critical organization.

And in particular, if there's a disparate political organization, if the citizens — if minority citizens in one part of the city are particularly organized, that makes a district remedy particularly appropriate. If minority citizens are equally organized throughout the City, that may make another remedy more appropriate.

So the -- as I understand it, in the Pico Neighborhood minority citizens in particular are -- are quite a bit more organized than Latino citizens throughout the rest of Santa Monica.

One fact that bears on that is the recent 2016 Democratic primary election in California, and in Santa Monica in particular. As in much of the rest of California and much of the rest of the country, Latino citizens generally in California favored Secretary Clinton in the Democratic primary, and in Santa Monica Latino citizens and the rest of Santa Monica favored Secretary Clinton.

But in the Pico Neighborhood, in this area, as I understand it, Mr. de la Torre was the chair of Latinos for Bernie Sanders, and that's relevant because he was able to mobilize the citizens of the area to vote for Mr. Sanders in a way that, had the election been districted, Mr. Sanders would have won the area around the Pico Neighborhood.

Obviously it wasn't districted, but

Mr. Sanders won the Democratic primary in that area and
lost Santa Monica-wide, and to me, that -- that speaks

```
1
     at least as an example of the organization possible in
2
     that community.
3
                  It's not to say the organization will
     respond that way for every single candidate, but it's a
4
5
     powerful example, given the prominence of organizing the
     presidential election.
6
7
                  Okay. So I -- did you learn about
           0.
8
     Mr. de la Torre's involvement in the Sanders campaign
9
     from a newspaper article?
10
           Α.
                  From sources on the web, yes.
11
           Q.
                  Okay. Let's put up one of those.
12
     Exhibit 208, please.
13
                  And, Professor Levitt, I'll just ask, is
14
     this one of the newspaper articles that you reviewed?
15
                  It seems to be, yes. This is familiar.
           Α.
                  Okay. And it described Mr. de la Torre's
16
           Ο.
17
     work on -- with the Sanders campaign?
18
                  It does.
           Α.
19
           Q.
                  Thank you.
20
21
                  (Exhibit Number 208, identified:
22
                Newspaper article.)
23
24
     BY MR. SHENKMAN:
25
                  Let's go to Exhibit 256, please.
                  And, Professor Levitt, if you could
26
27
     describe to us what this map shows.
28
                  This map I believe was put together by
           Α.
```

Mr. Ely. It shows the simple results in the presidential primary by precinct. Some of the precincts are wholly within Santa Monica, some are not wholly within Santa Monica.

Sorry, they're all wholly within

Santa Monica. Some of the precincts are wholly within

Mr. Ely's demonstrative district, some are not.

- Q. Okay. And the black line outlining the one, that's his illustrative district?
- A. As I understand it, that's the illustrative Pico Neighborhood district that he's drawn.
  - Q. Okay.

A. The precincts, the small -- well, green lines on the screen or gray lines on the exhibit, the thin lines represent each individual precinct. The precincts that are a pleasing beige on screen or white or gray on the exhibit paper voted for Secretary Clinton. The precincts that are dark green on the screen or a darker gray on the paper voted for Mr. Sanders, Senator Sanders.

And this is -- this is what I was talking about and showing, the greater -- or the concentrated organization of the Latino community in particular.

These results aren't just the Latino community, but they show — they reflect the support of the Latino community in ways that drive what would have been an electoral win had that election been taken place in districts.

```
Based on what we've discussed and anything
 1
           0.
 2
     else, do you have an opinion on whether Mr. Ely's
 3
     seven-district map would enhance Latino voting power
 4
     over the current system in Santa Monica?
 5
           Α.
                  Over the current system, yes, I believe
     that it would.
 6
 7
           Q.
                  Thank you.
 8
                  Let's move to cumulative voting, okay?
 9
           Α.
                  Okay.
                  Could you explain to the Court what
10
           0.
11
     cumulative voting is, and if you'd -- like you've got
12
     some markers and the white easel if you need it.
13
           Α.
                  Sure.
14
                  And it may actually be easier, Your Honor,
15
     if I show --
16
           THE COURT: Yes, of course.
17
           THE WITNESS: -- how the ballot actually works.
18
           THE COURT: Hold on. We should make that an
19
     exhibit. I'm not sure which number we're at, but 322 I
20
     think is where we are.
21
                  Would you write the number "322" on the
22
     bottom right of that paper?
23
           THE WITNESS: Of course.
24
           THE COURT: You're going to write on that paper,
25
     right?
           THE WITNESS: Yes, if that's --
26
27
           THE COURT: Yes.
28
           THE WITNESS: -- all right with Your Honor.
```

```
1
           THE CLERK: Did you say 322?
2
           THE COURT: Yes, uh-huh.
3
 4
                  (Exhibit Number 322, identified:
5
                   Diagram of Mr. Levitt.)
 6
7
           THE COURT: Okay. You may start.
8
           THE WITNESS: So in a cumulative voting system --
9
     we've been speaking about districts. A cumulative
     voting system would work -- so in the entire City of
10
11
     Santa Monica the jurisdiction would stay as a whole
12
     jurisdiction rather than subdividing. But instead of
13
     the current system -- in the current system, if you
14
     have -- if you have four seats up (indicating) -- and
15
     I'll get to what happens if you have five, six or
     seven -- if you have four seats up, as currently happens
16
17
     in Santa Monica's presidential election years, then
     every voter can vote for every seat, and the majority in
18
     the City of Santa Monica, if they are cohesive, will
19
20
     reliably win every election.
21
                  In a cumulative voting system, if you have
22
     four seats up and various candidates, every voter has
23
     four votes, but he or she can spend those four votes
24
     however she wishes.
25
           THE COURT: So you could throw your votes behind
26
     one candidate?
27
           THE WITNESS: Correct. Exactly right, Your Honor.
28
                  So you can decide that you want to spend
```

all four votes on this particular candidate. In the alternative, you can spend two votes on one candidate and one vote on each of two others, or any combination of four votes.

And what that accomplishes is it allows the majority to win most elections, but it allows strong minority preferences of whatever kind, racial or ethnic minorities, political minorities, what have you, but strong minority preferences to win elections as well. And there's a formula that allows you to tell exactly how many modes you need under the most adverse conditions.

If the opposition is entirely arrayed against you and distributes their votes perfectly strategically, you know that you're going to win an election with what's called the "threshold of exclusion." That in a four-vote election is going to be a fifth of the vote.

So if you have 20 percent of the votes, you are guaranteed to win one of the seats in a four-seat election. If everybody votes perfectly strategically on your side and the other side votes perfectly strategically against you, you will always win.

THE COURT: Even in a racial polarized situation?

THE WITNESS: Even when it's racially polarized,

the fact of an alternative way of accumulating votes

like this says that worst-case scenario, everything goes

wrong against me, the opposition puts up one candidate

```
1
     and only one candidate in every seat and they get all of
    their voters to show up and all of them vote with
2
    perfect strategy, I still know that if I have 20 percent
3
    of the votes in this election, I can win at least one
4
5
    seat.
                  If everything doesn't go perfectly for the
6
7
    other side, for the opposition, you may actually win an
8
    election with far less than 20 percent of the vote.
9
    this is worst-case scenario. Twenty percent of the
    votes in a four-seat election is guaranteed.
10
11
                  As the number of seats go up, the threshold
    drops, and so for a seven-seat election --
12
13
           THE COURT: So as the number of seats increase,
14
    what's the outcome?
15
          THE WITNESS: The outcome is that the threshold
    drops. The formula --
16
17
           THE COURT: The 20 percent part?
           THE WITNESS: The 20 percent drops.
18
19
          MR. SHENKMAN: You can use the other page too if
20
    you'd like.
21
           THE WITNESS: We should use another page? I don't
22
    want to -- I'm not sure that the entire series of pages
23
    will be Exhibit 322.
24
           THE COURT: Yes, they will be.
25
           THE WITNESS: Okay. So the formula for really any
26
    set of elections, but particularly one of these
27
    alternatives, is one over the number of seats, n plus
28
     one. So in a three-seat election, if you have
```

```
1
     25 percent of the votes in a cumulative voting system,
2
     that's a guarantee. That worst-case scenario, everybody
     else votes perfectly strategically with 25 percent of
3
     the votes, I can make sure that my candidate wins. Even
4
5
     under perfect racial polarization.
                  In a four-seat election, it's 20 percent.
6
7
     One over five.
                     In a seven-seat election, it's
8
     12.5 percent.
                  And if the opposition does not vote
9
     perfectly strategically, if they run more candidates
10
11
     than just one per seat, if people split their votes, it
12
     may be possible to win with fewer than 12.5 percent of
13
     the votes. But at that point it's guaranteed.
14
     BY MR. SHENKMAN:
15
                  Has cumulative voting been ordered in
           0.
     Federal Voting Rights Act cases, to your knowledge?
16
17
                  It has. It's been both adopted voluntarily
     by jurisdictions and been ordered as a remedy in
18
19
     litigation. About -- between 60 and 70 smaller
20
     jurisdictions use it at the moment.
21
                  Okay. Are you familiar with the Village of
           Q.
     Port Chester?
22
23
           Α.
                  I am.
24
                  Is that one of the jurisdictions that
25
     employs cumulative voting?
26
           MS. HENRY: Objection, Your Honor.
27
           THE WITNESS: Yes.
```

MS. HENRY: To the extent that the Village of Port

Chester is not analogous to the City of Santa Monica based on demographics, the minority population at issue, the size of the minority group at issue, it is irrelevant to this case and whether — what remedy might be appropriate if Plaintiffs are able to establish all of the elements under the C.V.R.A.

MR. SHENKMAN: I wasn't intending on having
Professor Levitt compare Port Chester and its -- and the
effectiveness of cumulative voting there to Santa
Monica. What I was trying to elicit is that Port
Chester did adopt this and what in fact they did.

Because under <u>Howard V. City of Palmdale</u>, the appellate court said that trial courts in California Voting Rights Act cases have the authority to implement, at least insofar — at least the remedies that have been ordered by federal courts in Federal Voting Rights Act cases. So I just want to elicit what in fact they did in that case.

MS. HENRY: If Plaintiffs' council is not intending to analogize the City of Santa Monica, then it's not relevant. If he's merely making a point about what the law provides, Plaintiffs' counsel is free to argue that in closing briefs. But this witness is not allowed to provide legal conclusions for the Court to draw.

MR. SHENKMAN: Well, I'm not going to ask

Professor Levitt what the Court can or can't do. I

simply want Professor Levitt to explain what that

1 particular court did. And then what I said about the appellate court and Howard v. the City of Palmdale, 2 providing, you know, this is the authority of the trial 3 4 court, that's certainly not something Professor Levitt 5 would testify to. MS. HENRY: A remedy that's inapposite is not 6 7 relevant to this case, and, again, Plaintiffs' counsel 8 can argue Jauregui and what the case in the City of Port 9 Chester -- or sorry, the Village of Port Chester held in 10 their closing briefs. 11 THE COURT: Overruled. He can answer. 12 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MR. SHENKMAN: 13 14 Q. Okay. In -- you're familiar with the 15 Federal Voting Rights Act case involving the Village of Port Chester? 16 17 Α. I am. And you were involved in that case; is that 18 Ο. 19 correct? 20 Α. I was. At the time I represented the 21 amicus in that case. 22 Okay. Who was the amicus? Q. 23 Α. It was an organization called "Fair Vote." 24 And they advocate for certain things? Q. 25 They do. They -- they advocate for various

different election systems and election structures and

administrative procedures, and in that case they were

advocating for at least the availability of what are

26

27

known as alternative remedies, like cumulative voting.

- Q. Okay. And ultimately did the Court in that case order cumulative voting in the Village of Port Chester?
  - A. It did.

- Q. How many seats were on the Village of Port Chester's governing board?
- A. I believe five, but I'd have to refresh my recollection about that.
- Q. Okay. Prior to the Federal Voting Rights
  Act case, were those elections staggered?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And did the Court in the Village -- in -- order that the Village of Port Chester's elections be unstaggered?
- A. Yes. So the -- I mentioned that the threshold of exclusion drops the number of votes that you have to win in a race to guarantee a seat drops with the number of seats available.

In Port Chester, as in Santa Monica, some of the members of the trustee board were elected in -- in mid-term years, some were elected in presidential years, and the Court ordered that all of the elections would happen in the same cycle in order to make sure that more seats would be up at the same time, in order to lower the threshold at which the Latino population of Port Chester could be expected to win.

Q. Have you had occasion to review academic

1 literature about the performance of cumulative voting? I have. 2 3 Q. Did you review materials authored by Richard Engstrom? 4 5 Α. Yes. And what -- what's the sum and substance of 6 Q. 7 the academic literature on the effectiveness of 8 cumulative voting? MS. HENRY: Objection, Your Honor. Hearsay and 9 irrelevant to the extent it doesn't speak to cities, 10 11 jurisdictions that are analogous based on the 12 demographics and minority population at issue as --13 analogous to the City of Santa Monica. 14 MR. SHENKMAN: Your Honor, I'd actually think that 15 some of those cities are going to, if you'll allow Professor Levitt to explain, have a minority population 16 17 both above and below the Latino population -- citizen voting age population of Santa Monica. 18 19 MS. HENRY: And to the extent that People V. 20 Sanchez has held that expert opinion cannot be based on 21 hearsay documents that provide case specific facts, 22 that's my impression it should be also excluded on that 23 basis. 24 THE COURT: Well, is he providing anything about 25 Santa Monica right now? 26 MR. SHENKMAN: No. He's simply providing what the 27 academic literature is showing about --28 THE COURT: Okay. You may answer. Overruled.

THE WITNESS: So in general, as referenced, cumulative voting has different effects in different places. But under certain conditions, particularly where there's education about how the system works, because it may be less familiar with to some voters, it has been effective in providing minorities, even a low proportion of minorities, the opportunity to both influence and elect candidates of choice.

Professor Engstrom writes quite frequently on alternative voting systems. One of the case studies that he did involved a number of jurisdictions in the south, particularly in I believe Texas and Alabama. And he cataloged a number of jurisdictions with quite small populations by voting age population.

In those instances they were
African-American voting age population.
African-American voting age population and citizen
voting population in the South is quite similar.

THE COURT: What would that be? You said low number. What would be the low number, considered low?

THE WITNESS: So in the elections he studied, there were I believe at least two jurisdictions where the African-American population in the city or in the town was 10.2 percent and 10.6 percent, I believe?

Those — each of those towns elected seven members to their city council or board of trustees that are a similar city governance structure, and at seven members the threshold of exclusion is around 12.5 percent.

1 12.5 percent of the actual voters who show up can be 2 quaranteed a seat even under the most adverse 3 conditions. 4 In these instances, voters -- populations 5 of 10.2 percent, 10.6 percent actually succeeded in 6 electing candidates of their choice to the governing 7 board. 8 THE COURT: Remind me again what the number 12.5 9 is and 20 percent that we talked about earlier. 10 THE WITNESS: Yes. 11 THE COURT: What does that represent again? 12 THE WITNESS: It represents the number of votes 13 once you add the final ballots, the final tallies. The 14 number of votes that you have -- that if you have, you 15 can be sure you'll elect somebody even under the most adverse conditions. 16 17 So if everything else --THE COURT: You mean of all the people casting 18 19 votes? 20 THE WITNESS: Yes. 21 THE COURT: If you have 20 percent of them who vote for one candidate --22 23 THE WITNESS: Yes. 24 THE COURT: -- then that candidate will win? 25 THE WITNESS: Will win, even if all else goes 26 wrong. And if all else doesn't go wrong, it's certainly 27 available to where that number is lower than that. But 28 if all else goes wrong, 20 percent of the final votes

1 cast for one candidate when there are four seats up for election means that you'll win one of those four seats. 2 THE COURT: And seven is 12.5? 3 4 THE WITNESS: Correct. So if your group has 5 12.5 percent of the votes cast when there's seven seats 6 up for election and everybody in the group puts all of 7 their money on one candidate --8 THE COURT: Right. 9 THE WITNESS: -- they'll win at least one of those 10 seven seats. Even if all else goes wrong. 11 BY MR. SHENKMAN: Okay. Based on all of this that we've 12 Q. 13 discussed about cumulative voting, do you have an 14 opinion on whether cumulative voting would enhance 15 Latino voting power over the current system in Santa Monica? 16 17 Α. I do. And what is that opinion? 18 Q. It would. So under the current structure 19 Α. 20 in Santa Monica, if all else goes wrong, you need more 21 than 50 percent of the votes for each of the seats up in any Santa Monica election, and a structure like this 22 23 means that it's possible to win an election for a 24 strongly concentrated minority. 25 Not geographically concentrated, but one 26 that is organized, it's possible to win an election with 27 far fewer of the total votes cast. 28 THE COURT: Now, does that include all the Latinos

1 in the other districts? Because you know they're not the majority in the other districts. 2 3 THE WITNESS: Correct. So in a cumulative voting system there's usually no need to have districts at all. 4 5 THE COURT: Okay. THE WITNESS: So that would include -- each of the 6 7 citizens of Santa Monica would be able to cast their 8 votes and accumulate them and add them throughout the 9 City. 10 And so, yes, that's available not only for 11 the citizens in any particular neighborhood and any 12 particular district, but throughout the City. 13 THE COURT: So does that enhance I guess the 14 voting power of those outside of District One? Latinos 15 outside of District One? THE WITNESS: It would. At least it would 16 17 certainly do so over and above the existing system 18 today. BY MR. SHENKMAN: 19 20 Q. Okay. Could you turn to limited voting. 21 Sure. Α. Okay. I'll ask you -- you've got the white 22 Q. 23 easel, maybe we should start another exhibit number, but 24 could you explain limited voting for the Court, please. Sure. And at your preference whether you 25

MR. SHENKMAN: Why don't we start Exhibit 323, I think we're on.

want another exhibit number or not.

26

27

1 THE COURT: Okay. Now, what subject area is this 2 chart? 3 MR. SHENKMAN: Limited voting, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Limited voting, okay. 5 (Exhibit Number 323, identified: 6 7 Limited Voting Chart.) 8 9 THE WITNESS: (Indicating.) So limited voting similarly does not depend on districts. It would be 10 11 something that would be available throughout a 12 jurisdiction like the City of Santa Monica. And it 13 simply refers to casting fewer than the total number of 14 seats. 15 So in a standard election, four people up for election, I vote for each of the seats. In a 16 17 limited voting scenario, I might be able to vote only 18 for three seats (indicating). Or two seats or one seat. 19 And what that does is it stops the majority 20 from winning every race. Like a cumulative voting 21 system, the majority wins most of the time, but it 22 allows room for extremely strong minority preferences to 23 elect at least one candidate of choice. 24 The most common -- I'm sorry. 25 THE COURT: Isn't that the most effective when 26 there's racial polarization? Because the minority 27 candidate won't get any other votes, the White votes. 28 THE WITNESS: So it actually works similarly with

cumulative voting. There's a threshold of exclusion.

And yes, when -- under the worst-case scenario -
there's a formula for knowing exactly how many votes you
have to win. The formula is the number of -- sorry, the
number of votes in which -- to which you're entitled

over the number of votes plus the number of seats up for
an election.

The most common limited voting scenario — and this makes the math much, much easier. The most common limited voting scenario is often known as bullet voting.

THE COURT: What? I'm sorry.

THE WITNESS: Bullet voting. It's just one vote. So four seats are up, but each person can only vote for one of those seats. In a scenario like that, the formula resolves itself to one permissible vote over one plus the number of seats. It's the same formula that we saw before.

And so what this does is essentially says the majority will be able -- will be forced to split its vote. It won't be able to win every seat all the time.

The minority can bullet vote with all of their support behind one particular candidate, and if the minority has more than 20 percent of the votes that are cast, again, under the most adverse conditions, will be sure that their candidate wins.

So if there -- the minority group is cohesive behind one candidate, with the opportunity to

1 vote for just one seat out of four --THE COURT: You're assuming that -- for example, 2 3 the White vote would be split up. Maybe they like one candidate and they throw all their votes behind that one 4 5 candidate. 6 THE WITNESS: Yes. 7 THE COURT: That would always defeat the minority candidate under that situation. THE WITNESS: For that one seat, Your Honor. But 9 because of the limited voting structure -- so that's 10 11 exactly why this works. Exactly as Your Honor has 12 indicated --13 THE COURT: Oh, okay. 14 THE WITNESS: -- if all of the majority throws 15 their votes behind this one seat, that means there's still three seats available in the election. 16 17 THE COURT: I see. So -- they'll at least get one. Minorities would at least get one? 18 19 THE WITNESS: Correct. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 THE WITNESS: And it works for exactly the reason 22 that you suggested. When the majority can vote for 23 every single seat, they'll win every single race. When 24 the majority can only vote for one -- when each voter 25 can only vote for one seat, if all of the Anglo 26 population decides they prefer one candidate, there are

If the majority population splits their

still three open seats available for minorities.

27

1 vote, then you necessarily know if you -- if your group has more than 20 percent of the final votes cast in a 2 four-seat race, that that candidate will be elected. 3 4 Some limited voting systems allow more than 5 one vote, but it's easiest to understand when you have just one vote to offer. But the formula still reduces 6 7 the threshold. 8 So the number of votes you're permitted over the number of votes you're permitted plus the 9 number of seats still describes, again, under the most 10 11 adverse circumstances, how -- what portion of the final 12 voting tally you need in order to guarantee a seat. 13 With seven seats, it's -- it's exactly the 14 same as with cumulative voting. If there's one vote 15 permitted, 12.5 percent of the vote will guarantee at least one of those seven seats. 16 17 THE COURT: Remind me what the Latino population 18 is city-wide in Santa Monica. 19 THE WITNESS: It's -- I believe it's 13.2 percent. 20 And that was with the same caveat about the time range 21 being from 2011 to 2016. BY MR. SHENKMAN: 22 23 And, Professor, the 13.2 number, is that citizen voting age population or just raw population? 24

A. That's citizen voting age population, and I believe that's from Dr. Morrison's calculations. I believe Mr. Ely had similar calculations in the same range. I -- I'm taking the 13.2 percent from

25

26

27

28

Dr. Morrison.

- Q. Okay. Is it possible the 13.2 is actually the 2010 through 2015 ACS numbers?
- A. It is possible. It's a five-year bloc of the American Community Survey, which is the -- the best information we have to assess citizen voting age population, and it's either -- it's possible it's 2010 to 2015. I thought it was 2011 to 2016, but it's entirely possible.
- Q. Okay. Have you seen the number

  13.6 percent for the 2016 American Community Survey?
- A. That sounds familiar. I cannot recall whether that's from Dr. Morrison or Mr. Ely.
  - Q. Okay. And we discussed with respect to cumulative voting Dr. Engstrom's study and how it had been effective in other places. Has Dr. Engstrom done a similar study with respect to limited voting?
- A. He has. As have others. And limited voting is in place in between 80 and 90 jurisdictions.

  I believe Dr. Engstrom's study focused on Alabama, where there was a large set of cities and towns that implemented limited voting as a result of the Voting Rights Act settlement.

And there too the members of the African-American population, members of the African-American community were able to elect candidates of their choice with a wide range of populations, but as low as 10 percent and change in the cities that had

1 seven members all up for election at the same time. 2 So it worked much as cumulative voting 3 worked. It requires a little less education because it's a little more familiar to tell somebody, I know 4 5 there are four seats open, just vote for one. It's also quite easy to implement using the existing machinery for 6 7 casting and counting elections. That's something --8 THE COURT: It's easier or not easier? 9 THE WITNESS: Easier than cumulative voting. It 10 is --11 THE COURT: Because of the machinery --12 THE WITNESS: Correct. 13 THE COURT: -- available? Okay. 14 THE WITNESS: It does not require reprogramming of 15 anything. Either casting or counting. Cumulative voting requires -- it is possible to run on the existing 16 17 machinery. It requires an adjustment to the ballot 18 style. 19 BY MR. SHENKMAN: 20 Q. Okay. And I perhaps -- perhaps we should 21 go into that ballot style. If we could pull up Exhibit 206, please. 22 And Professor Levitt, is this an example of 23 24 cumulative -- a cumulative voting ballot? 25 This is -- yes, this is one way to design a 26 cumulative voting ballot. 27 28

(Exhibit Number 206, identified:

Cumulative voting ballot sample.)

THE WITNESS: You can see the difference, the ——
this is Amarillo, Texas, in 2013. This is just an
example. There are other ways to do it.

The Amarillo Junior College Board of Regents is a straight-up plurality election. Vote for one person out of the two. That's the election in the lower right-hand side of the page. The -- for a two-year term.

For the six-year term, that was an election that took place under cumulative voting, and you could see that there were three seats. Each voter had three votes, and this was one way to execute, allowing you to spend however many votes you wished on a particular candidate.

So if you wanted -- if I as a voter wanted to put all three votes on Marie Ellyson, I would just check each of the boxes by Maria Ellyson's name. If I wanted to spend two votes for Maria Ellyson and two votes for David Woodburn, I could do that.

This ballot may look a little unusual to a voter. But it's possible to run with the current machinery. This just tallies exactly as a more usual race in Santa Monica or in Los Angeles County would be tallied.

Q. Okay. Let's turn back to limited voting

- for a moment. Has limited voting been ordered by federal courts in Federal Voting Rights Act cases?
- A. It has. Including -- well, that was a -- some of the litigation in Alabama was a settlement and some of it was a court order. But yes --
  - Q. Okay.
  - A. -- it had.
  - Q. Are you familiar with Euclid, Ohio?
  - A. I am.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. Was limited voting ordered in a Federal Voting Rights Act case about Euclid, Ohio?
  - A. Yes, I believe, if I'm not mistaken, it was the school board in Euclid where a federal court ordered limited voting.
- 15 Q. Okay.
- A. And it was the same -- I believe the Court ordered the single vote bullet form of limited voting.

  Vote for one candidate in a multi-seat election.
  - Q. Okay. Do you have an opinion on whether limited voting would enhance Latino voting power over the current system in Santa Monica?
    - A. I do.
    - Q. What is that opinion?
- A. I believe that it would, for many of the same reasons. At present, if all else goes wrong for the Latino population, they would need to win 50 percent of the vote in a Santa Monica council election. That's going to be quite difficult.

```
1
                  Under a limited voting structure,
2
     particularly with seven seats up for an election, they
3
     would have to win 12.5 percent of the vote and that's
     much more achievable.
4
5
           Q.
                  Okay. Let's talk about ranked choice
6
     voting, okay?
7
           THE COURT: Sorry. What was that?
           MR. SHENKMAN: Ranked choice voting.
9
           THE COURT: Ranked meaning your first choice,
     second choice, third choice?
10
11
           THE WITNESS: Exactly.
12
     BY MR. SHENKMAN:
13
                  Have you seen anything about the discussion
14
     in 1992 in Santa Monica about changing the election
15
     system?
                  I recall that there was that discussion,
16
           Α.
17
     yes.
                  Okay. And do you recall seeing a mention
18
    to single transferable vote?
19
20
           Α.
                  Yes.
21
                  Is that the same thing as ranked choice
           Q.
22
     voting?
23
                  Yes. It's their -- there are two terms
24
     that are used interchangeably. Sometimes one is used
25
     for a single member election, like a mayoral race, and
     the other is used for a multi-member race. But they
26
27
     describe the same thing.
28
           Q.
                  Okay. Could you explain to the Court what
```

```
1
     ranked choice voting, or also known as single
     transferable vote, is all about?
2
3
           Α.
                  Sure. And I don't know if you want a new
     exhibit number for this.
4
5
           MR. SHENKMAN: Yes.
           THE COURT: What's the new exhibit number?
6
7
           MR. SHENKMAN: It would be 324.
8
           THE COURT: 324.
9
                  (Exhibit Number 324, identified:
10
11
                   Diagram by Mr. Levitt, ranked
12
                   choice voting.)
13
14
                   (PAUSE IN THE PROCEEDINGS.)
15
           THE WITNESS: (Indicating.) Looking here, that
16
     doesn't -- I don't know whether it's two Rs or one. It
17
18
     doesn't look right.
19
                  The -- a ranked choice system, from the
20
     voters' end actually is entirely intuitive. It's
21
     exactly as Your Honor suggested. If there are four
22
     seats, the voter doesn't need to worry about the seats
23
     at all. They just rank their particular choices.
24
                  So I like this person first, I like that
25
     person second, I like this person third, I like that
26
     person fourth, and so on. For the voter it's really
27
     just a list of candidates and a number order.
28
                  And like the other alternative voting
```

systems I've discussed, this is a mechanism for ensuring that majorities win most of the seats but allowing strong minority preferences to also win.

The way that these votes are tallied -there are a number of different ways that these votes
can be tallied. The basic structure says any candidate
with more than the threshold, same threshold exclusion,
so more than 13 percent, anybody that gets more than
13 percent of the first vote wins. For those -- well,
actually, it's easier if there are four seats,
20 percent. Like the number's easier.

So anybody that gets more than 20 percent of a first place vote wins. Any votes above 20 percent are distributed to the second place proportionately so that no vote is wasted. The idea is to take only the amount of support that a candidate needs to win, and distribute the remainder of the support. If any of the second-place candidates then get more than 20 percent, they win.

If not, you take the candidate who will have lost, the candidate that comes in with the fewest first place votes, and you distribute their support to their second place contenders so that no vote is wasted. And you eventually fill up the number of seats with people who have cleared the threshold.

In -- it may be easier to understand the tally in a one-seat race. Anybody that gets over 50 percent wins. If you don't get over 50 percent, you

take the person who did the poorest and you redistribute their support. In a multi-member race, it just works similarly. The calculation is a little different, but the same threshold of exclusion applies in a four seat race.

All else goes wrong. If my team, if my group of voters has more than 20 percent of the vote behind a first choice candidate, that person will win.

Ranked choice voting takes secondary preferences into account, and so it also tends to help some of the members of minority communities. It can be a little more difficult to implement on a ballot because now you need a way to have people understand not just how many votes are cast but which preference, and so --

THE COURT: So the person in fourth place -THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: -- whose voters -- you look at their rankings, and so you distribute their votes how again?

THE WITNESS: So this may be easier to show, Your Honor. If -- don't want to use any of the attorneys in the room.

MS. HENRY: As long as I win.

THE WITNESS: So if this is my ballot and I

vote -- I just rank them in exactly that order

(indicating), let's say that Candidate A has done least

well. This is my ballot. I love Candidate A. But

Candidate A gets a very low percentage. 2 percent of

the vote total. Candidate A is not going to win. Then

what you would do is you would take my vote and redistribute it as counting for my second preference, Candidate B.

If Candidate B is close to the threshold, that may mean that Candidate B wins. So it takes into account my second choice.

If Candidate B has really low support, then you redistribute that vote to Candidate C and so on. That's how the tally works.

voters, it can be a little bit less transparent to voters, it can be a little bit more difficult to implement with the existing election systems, but at the end of the day it functions mathematically in the same way. It allows strong majorities to have their candidate selected flat-out, and allows minorities with strong preferences the opportunity to elect a candidate of choice, even at lower numbers, and that the basic threshold, four seats, 20 percent, seven seats, 12.5 percent, still holds mathematically for a system like this.

MR. SHENKMAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Just wondering. Since there's more White voters, doesn't that give them more power under that circumstance?

THE WITNESS: Every ballot is still only counted once. And so like the limited voting structure, if the White voters all prefer a particular candidate over the threshold, that candidate gets elected. The -- their

2975

```
1
     other preferences are redistributed. But the math works
     such that if a minority candidate has really strong
2
    performance from his or her own community -- or not a
3
    minority candidate.
4
5
                  If the minority community all plumps behind
    one particular candidate, they will also be able to
6
7
    elect a candidate to that multi-seat race.
8
           THE COURT: So if the White majority splits their
    votes between two, that leaves two more for the
9
    minorities to try to select at least one?
10
11
           THE WITNESS: Correct.
12
          THE COURT: Okay.
13
           THE WITNESS: It's similar to limited voting in
14
    that respect. That's right, Your Honor.
15
    BY MR. SHENKMAN:
                 Okay. And why is this called single
16
           Ο.
17
    transferable vote?
18
                  So as indicated, each voter casts one
    ballot. That's a single vote. And it's transferable in
19
    the event that it would otherwise be wasted. So if I
20
21
    voted for a candidate who would have come in last, my --
    my support is transferred to my second choice candidate.
22
23
                 Okay. So in the sense that there's a
24
    single vote, it's similar to limited voting; is that
25
    correct?
26
           Α.
                  Correct.
27
           THE COURT: I'm going to break early. I have
```

somebody I have to meet. So I want you to come back at

28

```
1:30. Okay? We can start with our next subject.
 1
 2
           THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
 3
           MR. SHENKMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
           THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
 4
 5
           MR. MCRAE: Thank you, Your Honor.
 6
           MS. HENRY: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor,
 7
     may I take some photos of this?
           THE COURT: Yes, you may.
 8
 9
10
                  (Noon recess was taken until 1:30
11
                  p.m.)
12
                  (THE NEXT PAGE IS 2977.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```

1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
2	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
3	DEPARTMENT 28 HON. YVETTE M. PALAZUELOS, JUDGE		
4			
5			
6	PICO NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION, ) ET AL., )		
7	PLAINTIFFS, ) CASE NO. BC616804		
8	VS. ) REPORTER'S ) CERTIFICATE		
9	CITY OF SANTA MONICA, ET AL., )		
10	DEFENDANTS. )		
11	)		
12			
13	I, RHONA S. REDDIX, OFFICIAL REPORTER OF		
14	THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, FOR THE		
15	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE		
16	FOREGOING PAGES, 2896 THROUGH 2976, COMPRISE A FULL,		
17	TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS, A.M.		
18	SESSION, TAKEN IN THE ABOVE ENTITLED CAUSE ON AUGUST 28,		
19	2018.		
20	DATED THIS 29TH OF AUGUST, 2018.		
21	21122 11120 20111 01 1100001, 20101		
22			
23			
24			
25			
26	, CSR, RPR, CRR, RMR #10807 OFFICIAL REPORTER		
27	OLI TOTALI INDI OLITERI		
28			

MR. CARDONA:
[2] 2912/4 2913/4
MR. GORDON:
[1] 2896/21
MR. GRIMES: [1]
2896/23
MR. MCRAE: [5]
2896/25 2897/4
2913/20 2913/22
2976/4
MR. RUBIN: [2]
2896/15 2907/8
MR. SCOLNICK:
[30] 2896/27
2897/7 2897/10
2897/15 2897/20
2897/22 2897/25
2898/4 2898/21
2899/15 2899/19
2899/26 2900/4
2902/6 2903/1
2903/15 2904/7
2904/10 2904/13
2905/23 2908/25
2910/5 2911/1
2911/8 2911/20
2911/22 2911/24
2911/26 2912/3
2913/17
MR.
SHENKMAN: [68]
2896/17 2900/12

2901/11 2901/16
2901/19 2902/2
2902/5 2902/10
2902/19 2902/25
2903/6 2903/12
2903/23 2904/4
2904/20 2904/24
2905/10 2906/19
2907/1 2907/4
2907/11 2907/17
2907/23 2908/1
2908/14 2908/18
2908/22 2909/14
2911/4 2911/14
2913/8 2913/16
2913/21 2914/9
2917/8 2917/11
2919/2 2919/5
2919/18 2920/25
2920/27 2925/17
2926/5 2926/7
2926/21 2927/7
2928/10 2928/14
2928/19 2930/14
2931/11 2931/23
2934/27 2935/20
2938/9 2941/20
2952/18 2954/6
2954/25 2957/13
2957/25 2961/26
2962/2 2970/7
2971/4 2971/6

2974/20 2976/2 MS. ALARCON: [1] 2896/19 MS. HENRY: [39] 2897/1 2914/2 2917/4 2917/12 2919/24 2920/2 2921/26 2922/1 2922/8 2925/7 2926/8 2926/22 2927/6 2928/4 2928/13 2930/1 2930/21 2931/10 2931/13 2932/5 2933/26 2934/4 2934/18 2935/3 2935/14 2936/13 2937/2 2938/3 2938/17 2941/15 2942/6 2953/25 2953/27 2954/18 2955/5 2957/8 2957/18 2973/21 2976/5 THE CLERK: [1] 2949/28 THE COURT: [143] THE WITNESS: [70] 2913/24 2913/28 2914/4 2917/13 2917/19

THE WITNESS: [65] 2918/7 2919/6 2919/9 2919/14 2920/1 2920/4 2920/22 2921/13 2922/15 2927/9 2937/6 2937/9	2973/22 2974/24 2975/10 2975/12 2976/1 \$ \$10,000 [1] 2923/1 \$60,000 [1] 2924/11 \$900,000 [1] 2923/7 \$970,000 [1] 2921/5	2945/1 2965/19
2949/25 2949/27 2950/7 2950/26 2951/24 2952/14 2952/17 2952/20 2952/24 2953/26 2955/11 2957/28 2958/20 2959/9 2959/11 2959/19 2959/22 2959/24 2960/3 2960/8 2961/2 2961/5 2961/15 2962/7 2962/27 2963/12 2964/5 2964/8 2964/13 2964/18 2964/20 2965/18 2967/8 2967/11 2967/13 2968/2 2970/10 2971/14 2973/15 2973/18	-4 [1] 3/15  1 10 percent [1] 2966/28 10.2 percent [2] 2958/24 2959/5 10.6 percent [2] 2958/24 2959/5 10807 [3] 1/27 2896/5 2977/26 10TH [1] 1/21 12.5 [2] 2959/8 2960/3 12.5 percent [8] 2953/8 2953/12 2958/28 2959/1 2960/5 2965/15	13.9 percent [1] 2945/5 131 [1] 2/5 1685 [1] 2/15 18 [1] 3/2 180 [1] 2897/26 187 [1] 2901/6 187,041.61 [1] 2920/12 18th [1] 2912/19 192 [1] 2901/7 193 [1] 2901/7 1975 [1] 2901/6 1992 [1] 2970/14 1:30 [2] 2976/1 2976/10  2 2 percent [1] 2973/27

2919/18 2919/19   2914 [1] 3/4   30th [2] 2897/12
---

2930/21 2930/24	3 30th [1] 2897/16 31 percent [1] 2944/19 322 [6] 3/16 2949/19 2949/21 2950/1 2950/4 2952/23 323 [3] 3/17 2961/27 2962/6 324 [4] 3/18 2971/7 2971/8 2971/10 333 [1] 2/11 35-minute [1] 2903/23 356 [1] 2901/8 3774 [1] 1/23 3RD [1] 2/15 4 40 percent [2] 2937/6 2937/9 403,000 [2] 2921/8 2921/22 40s [2] 2935/13 2935/14 43 percent [1] 2931/28 43364 [1] 1/21 44 percent [3] 2931/18 2932/21 2933/2	45 percent [1] 2944/1 48 percent [1] 2935/17 49 percent [1] 2935/17  5 50 percent [6] 2930/10 2935/18 2960/21 2969/26 2972/28 2972/28 54TH [1] 1/23 6 60 [1] 2953/19 60,000 [1] 2923/7 600,000 [2] 2921/12 2921/22 7 70 [1] 2953/19 700,000 [1] 2923/13 8 8/28/18 [1] 3/2 80 [1] 2966/19 800,000 [1] 2923/14 9 90 [1] 2966/19 90043 [1] 1/24 90071 [1] 2/12 90265 [1] 1/17	2963/21 2966/26 2975/6 about [58] 2897/19 2898/6 2898/23 2900/14 2900/28 2901/10 2908/27 2909/3 2912/19 2912/23 2914/15
-----------------	--	--	--

A adverse [1] 2965/11 advice [1] 2912/22 advocate [2] 2955/24 2955/25 advocating [1] 2955/28 affect [2] 2941/15 2942/16 affected [1] 2940/3 affecting [1] 2943/19 affects [1] 2941/6 affirmatively [1] 2906/13 affordable [1] 2939/28 African [6] 2943/21 2958/16 2958/17 2958/23 2966/25 2966/26 African-American [6] 2943/21 2958/16 2958/17 2958/23 2966/25	2899/20 2903/16 2906/9 2907/10 2909/4 2910/12 2910/21 2923/16 2931/14 2931/20 2938/5 2942/9 2944/25 2955/7 2959/8 2959/11 2963/25 2965/10 2973/18 against [5] 2924/14 2928/27 2951/14 2928/27 2951/14 2928/27 2951/14 2929/20 2929/25 2931/6 2931/19 2932/21 2934/16 2934/18 2934/24 2935/11 2936/25 2941/9 2941/10 2942/24 2943/28 2944/23 2945/3 2945/5 2957/18 2958/14 2958/16 2958/17 2965/24 2965/25 2966/6	2977/6 2977/9 Alabama [3] 2958/12 2966/20 2969/4 ALARCON [2] 1/16 2896/21 all [56] 2897/22 2898/3 2898/10 2898/16 2898/21 2901/26 2902/5 2902/25 2902/28 2904/24 2905/7 2906/6 2909/1 2910/12 2910/22 2910/24 2913/6 2920/17 2920/19 2923/21 2923/23 2924/5 2931/4 2936/7 2945/9 2948/5 2949/28 2951/1 2952/1 2952/2 2954/5 2959/28 2960/6 2960/10 2960/28
African-American [6] 2943/21 2958/16 2958/17	2958/14 2958/16 2958/17 2965/24	2959/25 2959/26 2959/28 2960/6

all [5] 2971/23 2973/6 2974/27 2975/5 2976/4 allegations [1] 2912/21 alleged [1] 2936/19 alleviate [4] 2916/5 2924/3 2925/12 2936/18 allow [3] 2934/28 2957/15 2965/4 allowed [2] 2901/15 2954/24 allowing [3] 2899/11 2968/15 2972/2 allows [6] 2951/5 2951/6 2951/10 2962/22 2974/14 2974/15 almost [2] 2900/22 2923/7 alone [2] 2920/10 2942/17 already [2] 2899/6 2901/25 also [19] 2896/18 2904/15 2905/14 2907/4 2915/11 2915/20 2917/23 2919/26 2926/13	2929/12 2933/22 2939/27 2943/14 2957/22 2967/5 2971/1 2972/3 2973/10 2975/6 alternate [1] 2925/11 alternative [5] 2951/2 2951/26 2956/1 2958/10 2971/28 alternatives [1] 2952/27 always [2] 2951/23 2964/7 am [9] 2916/17 2928/2 2928/24 2930/26 2933/21 2934/12 2953/23 2955/17 2969/9 Amarillo [2] 2968/5 2968/7 American [8] 2943/21 2958/16 2958/17 2958/23 2966/5 2966/11 2966/25 2966/26 amicus [2] 2955/21 2955/22 among [3] 2925/2 2940/22 2944/14 amount [11]	2903/27 2920/9 2920/11 2920/13 2921/23 2922/9 2922/20 2923/24 2923/27 2924/22 2972/16 amounts [3] 2918/26 2922/6 2923/15 Anaheim [5] 2937/21 2937/23 2938/3 2938/6 2938/12 analogize [1] 2954/20 analogizing [1] 2936/21 analogous [9] 2925/16 2931/17 2931/22 2934/1 2935/19 2936/26 2954/1 2957/11 2957/13 and/or [1] 2915/26 ANDREA [2] 1/16 2896/20 ANGELES [7] 1/2 1/24 2/12 2896/3 2968/26 2977/2 2977/15 Anglo [1] 2964/25 anomalies [1]
--	---	---

anomalies [1] 2924/10 another [6] 2926/15 2932/12 2946/6 2952/21 2961/23 2961/26 answer [12] 2906/8 2906/12 2910/1 2914/23 2922/2 2922/3 2922/15 2927/6 2930/14 2934/20 2955/11 2957/28 answered [1] 2910/28 answering [4] 2905/1 2905/3 2906/13 2907/7 any [29] 2902/13 2902/14 2902/25 2903/24 2904/19 2904/20 2906/3 2908/5 2915/14 2925/12 2925/12 2930/18 2931/5 2933/6 2936/27 2937/18 2940/19 2943/6 2943/15 2951/3 2952/25 2960/22 2961/11	72/6 2972/13 72/17 2973/20 7body [3] 2972/8 72/12 2972/27 7more [1] 08/7 7one [2] 2903/4 07/20 7thing [10] 97/19 2899/2 00/26 2906/13 41/5 2945/24 49/1 2957/24 67/15 2970/13 100 com [1] 1/24 100 com [1] 1/24 100 com [1] 1/24 100 com [1] 1/24 100 com [1] 2920/3 100 co	approximate [1] 2929/1 approximately [1] 2944/28 April [2] 2912/18 2912/19 April 12th [1] 2912/18 April 18th [1] 2912/19 are [99] area [10] 2915/23 2915/25 2916/4 2916/12 2940/13 2946/19 2946/22 2946/24 2946/27 2962/1 areas [2] 2901/16 2915/9 aren't [2] 2899/1 2948/24 argue [2] 2954/23 2955/8 argued [1] 2909/24 argument [1] 2936/15 around [4] 2940/9 2945/9 2946/24 2958/28 arrangement [1] 2910/16 arrayed [1]
2961/11 2962/27 <sup>293</sup>	D4/D	arrayea [1]

$\mathbf{A}$	2944/16 2944/23	assess [1] 2966/6
arrayed [1]	2944/25 2945/10	assessing [2]
2951/13	2945/16 2945/16	2912/21 2945/26
arrive [5] 2920/15	2945/17 2946/7	<b>ASSOCIATION [3]</b>
2920/18 2920/20	2946/13 2946/20	1/4 2896/10 2977/5
2944/26 2944/27	2947/1 2948/10	assume [1] 2943/21
article [2] 2947/9	2950/11 2950/16	assuming [2]
2947/22	2951/9 2952/11	2906/5 2964/2
articles [1] 2947/14	2952/13 2953/18	at-large [11]
as [84] 2898/9	2956/1 2956/20	2915/28 2925/3
2900/2 2902/7	2957/12 2958/1	2927/15 2930/28
2902/7 2905/12	2963/10 2964/11	2933/7 2933/10
2905/14 2906/9	2965/14 2966/18	2933/14 2933/16
2907/13 2908/23	2966/22 2966/27	2933/23 2936/11
2908/23 2909/18	2966/28 2967/2	2937/23
2909/19 2909/24	2968/18 2968/25	attempt [1] 2916/8
2910/24 2911/5	2970/21 2971/1	attempting [1]
2911/5 2911/16	2971/21 2973/22	2925/22
2912/7 2912/15	2973/22 2974/2	attorney [3] 2909/8
2913/27 2913/27	2975/18	2911/3 2912/11
2917/12 2922/20	<b>Asian</b> [1] <b>2943/22</b>	attorney's [7] 2/14
2924/8 2925/4	ask [14] 2897/6	2910/3 2912/6
2926/11 2926/13	2905/2 2905/17	2912/9 2912/20
2927/16 2928/10	2905/17 2909/2	2912/25 2912/28
2929/19 2930/3	2913/9 2919/26	attorney-client [1]
2930/5 2930/14	2927/12 2930/16	2909/8
2931/17 2934/22	2930/21 2939/23	attorneys [1]
2935/16 2935/17	2947/13 2954/26	2973/20
2935/18 2936/23	2961/22	<b>AUGUST [6] 1/12</b>
2938/5 2939/15	asked [4] 2898/13	2896/3 2897/9
2939/19 2941/18	2905/7 2905/10	2897/11 2977/18
2941/18 2943/22	2917/27	2977/20

August 20th [2] 2897/9 2897/11 authored [1] 2957/3 authority [2] 2954/14 2955/3 availability [1] 2955/28 available [9] 2914/15 2915/18 2956/19 2959/27 2961/10 2962/11 2964/16 2964/27 2967/13 AVENUE [1] 2/11 average [1] 2922/27 avoid [2] 2899/18 2904/1	2905/27 ballot [13] 2915/14 2949/17 2967/17 2967/21 2967/24 2967/26 2968/2 2968/23 2973/12 2973/23 2973/26 2974/25 2975/19 ballots [2] 2915/19 2959/13 bare [2] 2929/12 2929/24 based [10] 2922/19 2927/16 2934/1 2936/12 2936/18 2949/1 2954/2 2957/11 2957/20 2960/12 basic [3] 2910/24 2972/6 2974/17	2920/21 2926/10 2928/9 2934/22 2946/21 2954/12 2958/5 2961/1 2962/26 2964/10 2967/3 2967/11 2973/12 been [25] 2897/13 2898/28 2899/21 2900/21 2903/20 2913/3 2913/13 2913/15 2927/24 2935/28 2937/18 2940/5 2940/6 2940/8 2946/23 2948/27 2948/27 2950/9 2953/15 2953/17 2953/18 2954/15 2958/6 2966/16 2969/1
2914/15 2915/18 2956/19 2959/27 2961/10 2962/11 2964/16 2964/27 2967/13 AVENUE [1] 2/11 average [1] 2922/27 avoid [2] 2899/18 2904/1 aware [1] 2916/15	2929/24 based [10] 2922/19 2927/16 2934/1 2936/12 2936/18 2949/1 2954/2 2957/11 2957/20 2960/12 basic [3] 2910/24	2913/15 2927/24 2935/28 2937/18 2940/5 2940/6 2940/8 2946/23 2948/27 2948/27 2950/9 2953/15 2953/17 2953/18 2954/15 2958/6 2966/16 2969/1
away [1] 2909/13  B back [9] 2899/3 2900/26 2902/8 2902/9 2909/4 2913/23 2914/4 2968/28 2975/28 background [1] 2900/14 backwards [1]	2957/23 BC616804 [4] 1/7 2896/1 2896/11 2977/7 be [97] bears [2] 2909/26 2946/11 because [17] 2899/21 2901/20 2903/8 2909/18	2933/11 2963/18 beginning [1] 2921/7 behalf [9] 2896/16 2896/22 2896/25 2896/27 2896/28 2897/2 2918/27 2920/12 2920/14 behind [7] 2950/25 2963/23 2963/28

В	below [1] 2957/17	2956/21 2958/26
behind [4] 2964/4	bent [1] 2905/27	2959/7 2968/7
2964/15 2973/8	Bernie [1] 2946/21	2969/13
2975/5	best [7] 2927/12	body [2] 2909/22
beige [1] 2948/16	2930/6 2931/21	2936/11
being [6] 2903/28	2934/26 2935/20	both [5] 2922/16
2912/22 2921/21	2938/8 2966/5	2945/9 2953/17
2922/13 2926/9	between [10]	2957/17 2958/7
2965/21	2912/10 2916/3	bottom [1] 2949/22
believe [39]	2916/3 2923/13	boxes [1] 2968/20
2897/11 2902/1	2924/9 2924/11	break [1] 2975/27
2908/15 2914/23	2925/19 2953/19	briefs [2] 2954/23
2915/1 2919/8	2966/19 2975/9	2955/10
2919/19 2928/25	beyond [1] 2913/11	bringing [1]
2919/19 2928/25 2929/12 2929/26	bit [14] 2900/14	2897/23
2932/12 2932/12	2914/18 2922/26	built [1] 2915/16
2932/12 2932/12 2932/19 2932/22	2923/9 2923/18	bullet [4] 2963/10
2932/19 2932/22 2932/25 2933/8	2923/19 2931/25	2963/13 2963/22
2932/23 2933/8 2933/11 2934/16	2935/1 2941/11	2969/17
2935/11 2934/10 2935/13 2935/22	2941/12 2942/5	$\overline{C}$
2937/20 2938/25	2946/9 2974/10	C TAND FOIL AGGG /
2938/27 2939/10	2974/11	C-VAP [8] 2930/7
2936/27 2939/10 2944/26 2944/28	black [1] 2948/8	2930/9 2933/2
2944/20 2944/28 2947/28 2949/5	bloc [4] 2943/19	2934/2 2934/27
	2943/23 2944/16	2935/28 2936/24
2956/8 2958/12	2966/4	2937/6
2958/22 2958/24	blue [1] 2920/19	C.V.R.A [1] 2954/6
2965/19 2965/26	board [14] 2899/4	Cal.App.3rd [1]
2965/27 2966/20	2900/23 2917/16	2901/6
2969/12 2969/16	2917/17 2919/10	calculated [1]
2969/24	2920/18 2923/17	2897/12
believes [2]	2923/17 2956/7	calculation [1]
2926/21 2926/28		2973/3

C	2917/15 2917/21	2974/10 2974/11
	2947/8 2947/17	2976/1
calculations [3]	can [62] 2897/28	can't [5] 2903/2
2939/20 2965/26	2898/25 2899/6	2915/17 2933/12
2965/27	2899/8 2900/6	2935/24 2954/27
CALIFORNIA [24]	2902/10 2902/15	candidate [50]
1/1 1/17 1/21 1/24	2903/5 2903/14	2929/28 2937/14
2/5 2/12 2/15	2903/22 2903/23	2942/2 2947/4
2896/3 2916/23	2904/22 2910/7	2950/26 2951/1
2922/7 2922/16	2910/14 2910/15	2951/2 2951/28
2922/17 2925/21	2910/14 2910/13	2952/1 2953/4
2927/28 2928/26	2913/8 2913/27	2959/22 2959/24
2929/23 2936/13	2914/9 2914/27	2960/1 2960/7
2940/23 2946/12		
2946/14 2946/15	2916/12 2918/12	2962/23 2962/27
2954/13 2977/1	2920/8 2920/23	2963/23 2963/26
2977/14	2924/5 2924/20	2963/28 2964/4
call [16] 2899/14	2928/8 2928/12	2964/5 2964/8
2901/18 2901/23	2930/6 2930/21	2964/26 2965/3
2902/14 2902/18	2935/19 2936/7	2968/17 2969/18
2902/20 2902/23	2936/24 2938/6	2972/6 2972/16
2903/4 2903/5	2938/11 2939/23	2972/20 2972/21
2903/8 2903/10	2942/18 2943/5	2973/8 2973/25
2903/15 2903/15	2950/18 2950/23	2973/26 2973/27
2909/2 2939/24	2950/28 2951/2	2973/28 2974/3
2942/28	2952/4 2952/19	2974/4 2974/5
called [4] 2941/13	2953/4 2954/27	2974/7 2974/8
2951/16 2955/23	2955/8 2955/11	2974/15 2974/16
2975/16	2959/1 2959/15	2974/27 2974/28
calls [1] 2942/8	2963/14 2963/22	2975/2 2975/4
campaign [8]	2964/22 2964/24	2975/6 2975/7
2916/5 2916/13	2964/25 2968/4	2975/21 2975/22
2916/23 2917/2	2972/6 2973/11	candidate's [1]

C	2928/6	2970/28
congressional [1]	contributions [2]	council [29] 2898/3
2923/13	2918/2 2918/27	2900/25 2910/18
consider [3]	control [3] 2917/17	2911/3 2911/7
2942/23 2945/20	2919/11 2920/20	2912/23 2912/27
2945/27	conversation [1]	2916/16 2917/16
considered [1]	2906/3	2920/9 2920/16
2958/20	copy [2] 2908/11	2921/5 2921/8
considering [1]	2917/6	2921/21 2921/24
2941/2	correct [18]	2922/7 2922/10
consistently [2]	2918/28 2928/27	2922/21 2923/1
2923/21 2943/18	2932/14 2932/15	2923/8 2923/11
constitute [1]	2933/18 2933/23	2923/20 2923/24
2905/4	2934/8 2937/24	2926/6 2926/7
consultant [1]	2950/27 2955/19	2937/19 2954/19
2906/18	2960/4 2961/3	2958/26 2969/27
consulting [9]	2964/19 2967/12	counsel [12]
2905/13 2905/14	2975/11 2975/25	2896/15 2900/18
2906/1 2907/13	2975/26 2977/17	2909/19 2920/7
2908/28 2909/20	correspond [1]	2925/19 2927/10
2910/16 2911/12	2919/8	2928/18 2935/6
2912/15	costs [1] 2924/24	2936/15 2936/19
contenders [1]	could [20] 2898/12	2954/22 2955/7
2972/23	2907/24 2908/26	counsel's [1]
contends [1]	2910/28 2914/22	2920/23
2936/20	2916/19 2926/18	count [1] 2915/19
content [3] 2906/25	2926/19 2934/13	counted [1]
2906/25 2911/17	2942/5 2947/26	2974/25
contests [1] 2918/5	2949/10 2950/25	counties [1] 2915/8
CONTINUED [3]	2956/27 2961/20	counting [3] 2967/7
1/25 2/2 2914/12	2961/24 2967/21	2967/15 2974/2
continuing [1]	2968/13 2968/22	country [1]
continuing [1]		

2970/28 2977/1 2977/14 Court's [7] 2900/11 2902/14 2903/25 2903/26 2911/15 2926/2 2938/10 courtroom [1] 2908/4  2953/15 2953/25 2954/9 2956/1 2956/3 2957/1 2957/8 2958/2 2960/13 2960/14 2960/13 2960/14 2966/15 2965/14 2966/15 2967/2  David [1] 2968/22 Davis [4] 2920/1 2920/10 2920/11 2920/22 Davis's [1] 2920/5 day [3] 2897/12 2898/5 2974/13 de [3] 2946/20
---

de [2] 2947/8 2947/16 deal [3] 2902/15 2905/8 2907/20 December [1] 2900/24 decide [1] 2950/28 decides [1] 2964/26 decision [1] 2944/10 defeat [2] 2899/17 2964/7 defendant [7] 2/7 2901/23 2902/23 2903/8 2904/6 2904/28 2908/23 Defendant's [1] 2925/19 DEFENDANTS [3] 1/9 2897/6 2977/10 defense [2] 2900/18 2909/18 degree [1] 2924/3 delineate [1] 2919/18 delineating [1] 2917/24 Democratic [3] 2946/12 2946/16	demonstrated [1] 2909/23 demonstrative [1] 2948/7 DEPARTMENT [3] 1/3 2896/4 2977/3 depend [1] 2962/10 deposition [5] 2900/17 2900/19 2901/22 2901/28 2902/15 depositions [2] 2898/3 2904/3 descent [1] 2932/28 describe [5] 2914/27 2916/20 2934/13 2947/27 2970/27 described [1]	determination [1] 2909/11 determine [2] 2905/28 2909/6 determining [1] 2906/10 detour [1] 2910/13 Diagram [2] 2950/5 2971/11 did [35] 2897/8 2901/10 2905/17 2905/20 2906/7
Democratic [3]	2970/27	2901/10 2905/17

D	2958/2 2958/2	2970/16
	2972/5 2973/3	disparate [1]
did [26] 2909/3	differs [1] 2927/20	2946/1
2909/6 2913/12	difficult [4]	disparities [1]
2928/28 2930/27	2923/28 2969/28	2916/6
2931/1 2933/6	2973/12 2974/11	dispersion [2]
2933/8 2933/24		2940/6 2940/8
2934/9 2942/23	difficulties [1]	
2942/25 2945/20	2898/14	dispute [1] 2907/6
2945/23 2947/7	diluted [1] 2922/14	distribute [3]
2950/1 2954/11	dilution [3] 2915/3	2972/17 2972/22
2954/11 2954/17	2925/13 2936/19	2973/18
2955/1 2956/2	direct [3] 3/3	distributed [1]
2956/5 2956/13	2901/5 2914/12	2972/14
2957/3 2958/11	direction [1]	distributes [1]
2973/1	2916/22	2951/14
didn't [6] 2899/22	discrete [2]	district [78]
2904/20 2907/27	2900/20 2936/11	2923/12 2923/13
2909/6 2909/20	discriminate [1]	2924/19 2925/4
2909/21	2909/24	2927/16 2929/10
difference [2]	discuss [2] 2913/7	2929/17 2929/18
2916/2 2968/4	2936/7	2929/22 2929/24
differences [2]	discussed [6]	2929/28 2930/6
2915/23 2925/19	2912/26 2913/13	2930/8 2930/28
different [20]	2949/1 2960/13	2931/8 2931/16
2925/10 2925/11	2966/14 2972/1	2931/18 2931/19
2925/13 2925/14	discusses [1]	2931/21 2932/1
2925/14 2925/15	2901/7	2932/2 2932/8
2926/24 2926/25	discussing [1]	2932/17 2932/19
2926/25 2926/27	2915/2	2932/20 2933/1
	discussion [5]	2933/17 2933/23
2927/21 2927/22	2901/25 2902/1	2933/26 2934/2
2927/23 2927/23	2940/4 2970/13	2934/8 2934/17
2936/22 2955/26		

D	2915/2 2915/5	2927/12 2929/1
D	2915/15 2915/17	2929/8 2933/9
district [46]	2915/20 2915/27	2936/22 2944/1
2934/24 2934/27	2916/4 2916/10	
2935/2 2935/2		2944/3 2945/5
2935/5 2935/7	2923/26 2924/2	2945/6 2945/8
2935/12 2935/19	2925/24 2926/5	2949/2 2954/27
2935/24 2936/3	2929/5 2929/8	2955/25 2960/13
2936/12 2936/18	2929/27 2931/5	2960/17 2961/17
2936/25 2936/27	2931/5 2931/9	2968/6 2968/22
2937/13 2937/13	2934/11 2934/14	2969/19 2969/22
2937/24 2937/26	2934/15 2935/27	2970/18 2974/1
2938/7 2938/8	2938/28 2939/3	2977/15
2939/8 2941/7	2939/8 2942/24	document [2]
2941/13 2941/18	2942/26 2943/4	2916/20 2919/20
2941/23 2942/5	2945/11 2945/16	documents [1]
2942/11 2942/13	2945/17 2945/27	2957/21
2942/14 2942/24	2948/28 2950/9	does [19] 2908/21
2942/26 2943/25	2961/1 2961/2	2910/20 2910/20
2943/27 2944/5	2961/4 2962/10	2918/7 2918/8
2944/7 2944/13	do [48] 2897/15	2918/10 2921/13
2945/4 2945/7	2901/3 2901/26	2923/23 2923/23
2946/4 2948/7	2901/27 2902/1	2927/3 2947/18
2948/9 2948/11	2902/10 2903/18	2953/9 2959/11
2949/3 2961/12	2904/5 2906/21	2960/28 2961/13
2961/14 2961/15	2907/1 2907/28	2962/10 2962/19
district-based [3]	2909/6 2910/10	2963/19 2967/14
2927/16 2936/12	2911/11 2913/20	doesn't [13]
2936/18	2914/1 2914/16	2898/24 2907/20
districted [2]	2914/17 2914/20	2910/21 2918/6
2946/24 2946/26	2914/25 2922/19	2920/3 2926/16
districts [40]	2922/24 2925/22	2952/6 2957/10
2914/19 2914/24	2926/10 2927/8	2959/26 2971/17

earlier [2] 2928/25 2959/9 early [1] 2975/27 easel [2] 2949/12 2961/23 easier [9] 2949/14 2963/9 2967/8 2967/8 2967/9 2972/10 2972/11 2972/26 2973/19 easiest [1] 2965/5 easily [1] 2915/13 easy [2] 2915/18 2967/6 economically [1] 2924/20 education [2] 2958/4 2967/3 effective [7] 2901/1	either [7] 2906/21 2918/26 2920/11 2920/13 2921/15 2966/7 2967/15 elect [6] 2958/8 2959/15 2962/23 2966/26 2974/16 2975/7 elected [8] 2915/14 2929/28 2937/19 2956/21 2956/22 2958/25 2965/3 2974/28 electing [1] 2959/6 election [77] 2915/12 2916/7 2917/21 2919/8 2919/17 2919/28 2921/4 2921/9 2924/4 2925/2	2942/28 2943/2 2943/7 2943/25 2944/14 2944/17 2946/12 2946/23 2947/6 2948/27 2950/17 2950/20 2951/16 2951/17 2951/21 2952/4 2952/8 2952/10 2952/12 2952/28 2953/6 2953/7 2955/26 2955/26 2960/2 2960/6 2960/22 2960/23 2960/26 2962/15 2962/16 2963/7 2968/12 2969/18 2968/12 2969/18 2969/27 2970/2
2972/10 2972/11 2972/26 2973/19 easiest [1] 2965/5 easily [1] 2915/13 easy [2] 2915/18 2967/6 economically [1] 2924/20 education [2] 2958/4 2967/3 effective [7] 2901/1 2925/24 2936/1 2936/28 2958/6 2962/25 2966/16 effectively [1] 2916/13	2956/21 2956/22 2958/25 2965/3 2974/28 electing [1] 2959/6 election [77] 2915/12 2916/7 2917/21 2919/8 2919/17 2919/28 2921/4 2921/9 2924/4 2925/2 2925/10 2925/10 2925/12 2926/12 2926/20 2926/27 2927/26 2929/13 2929/27 2931/8	2953/6 2953/7 2955/26 2955/26 2960/2 2960/6 2960/22 2960/23 2960/26 2962/15 2962/16 2963/7 2964/16 2967/1 2968/8 2968/9 2968/12 2969/18 2969/27 2970/2 2970/14 2970/25 2974/12 elections [33] 2916/16 2917/4 2917/28 2918/3
effectiveness [6] 2923/25 2941/6 2941/9 2944/5 2954/9 2957/7 effects [2] 2941/2 2958/2 eight [1] 2903/27	2932/9 2933/10 2933/12 2933/25 2934/8 2936/12 2936/18 2937/13 2937/16 2941/15 2942/1 2942/9 2942/16 2942/19	2918/17 2918/21 2919/14 2919/24 2921/3 2921/21 2922/10 2922/14 2922/21 2923/17 2923/25 2924/13 2927/16 2930/28

2933/23 2937/24 2944/8 2944/9 2945/15 2951/6 2951/9 2952/26 2956/11 2956/14 2956/23 2958/21 2967/7 electoral [2] 2945/12 2948/27 electorate [1] 2944/9 elements [1] 2954/6 elicit [3] 2935/26 2954/10 2954/17 elicited [2] 2935/5 2935/6 ELLERY [2] 1/20 2896/22 Ellyson [2] 2968/19 2968/21	925/26 2940/10 940/28 ly [6] 2931/20 934/25 2938/28 948/1 2965/27 966/13 ly's [5] 2939/8 939/20 2941/7 948/7 2949/2 inploys [1] 953/25 icountered [1] 900/14 id [4] 2900/12 902/26 2971/20 974/13 ided [2] 2903/28 914/15 ingstrom [3] 957/4 2958/9 966/16 ingstrom's [2]	entirely [4] 2935/14 2951/13 2966/9 2971/20 entities [2] 2918/3 2918/4 entitled [2] 2963/5 2977/18 Equalization [1] 2900/23 equally [1] 2946/5 ESQ [16] 1/16 1/16 1/19 1/20 1/20 1/23 2/4 2/7 2/8 2/8 2/9 2/9 2/10 2/10 2/11 2/14 essentially [2] 2935/23 2963/19 establish [3] 2906/12 2910/26 2954/5 established [3] 2906/6 2931/15 2933/28
electorate [1] 2944/9 elements [1] 2954/6 elicit [3] 2935/26 2954/10 2954/17 elicited [2] 2935/5 2935/6 ELLERY [2] 1/20 2896/22 Ellyson [2] 2968/19 2968/21 Ellyson's [1]	acountered [1] 900/14 ad [4] 2900/12 902/26 2971/20 974/13 aded [2] 2903/28 914/15 agstrom [3] 957/4 2958/9	1/19 1/20 1/20 1/23 2/4 2/7 2/8 2/8 2/9 2/9 2/10 2/10 2/11 2/14 essentially [2] 2935/23 2963/19 establish [3] 2906/12 2910/26 2954/5 established [3]

Existing [4] 2961/17 2967/6 2967/16 2974/12 exists [3] 2906/24 2907/19 2911/18 expect [6] 2922/28 2940/9 2944/8 2944/9 2944/12 2945/12 expectation [1] 2912/27 expected [2] 2901/13 2956/27 expedition [1] 2909/12 expenditure [2] 2924/13 2924/17 expenditures [2] 2918/2 2918/27 expenses [2] 2917/25 2917/25 expensive [1] 2924/5 experience [1] 2924/5 experience [1] 2921/23 expert [14] 2901/2 2905/13 2905/14 2906/1 2907/13 2908/28 2909/1 2909/2 12911/12	2912/15 2942/9 2957/20 experts [1] 2930/5 explain [6] 2920/6 2949/10 2954/28 2957/16 2961/24 2970/28 explanation [1] 2942/6 extent [7] 2927/19 2935/17 2936/21 2942/8 2953/28 2957/10 2957/19 extremely [1] 2962/22  F F.P.P.C [2] 2916/24 2917/12 fact [10] 2900/15 2901/10 2908/12 2909/24 2938/13 2944/8 2946/11 2951/26 2954/11 2951/26 2954/11 2955/21 factual [6] 2909/5 2909/11 2909/13 2910/7 2910/9 2910/24 fair [3] 2916/24 2944/18 2955/23	faith [3] 2899/4 2899/23 2902/10 fall [1] 2938/12 familiar [18] 2915/4 2928/1 2928/22 2930/25 2933/20 2934/10 2937/15 2937/21 2938/21 2938/27 2939/2 2947/15 2953/21 2955/14 2958/5 2966/12 2967/4 2969/8 families [1] 2940/13 far [5] 2902/7 2905/25 2909/10 2952/8 2960/27 Farias [4] 2926/1 2933/4 2933/6 2933/13 farther [2] 2910/23 2910/23 faster [1] 2940/24 favored [3] 2944/14 2946/15 2946/17 features [2] 2914/24 2914/27 federal [9] 2953/16 2955/15 2956/10
--	---	--

Federal [4] 2969/2 2969/2 2969/13 feel [1] 2942/18 fell [1] 2937/9 fewer [4] 2924/26 2953/12 2960/27 2962/13 fewest [1] 2972/21 fifth [1] 2951/18 fight [2] 2897/28 2899/18 fighting [2] 2898/23 2924/14 file [2] 2917/23 2917/24 filed [4] 2897/6 2897/14 2912/17 2912/18 filing [3] 2916/23 2917/2 2917/22 filings [4] 2917/15 2917/18 2917/19 2917/20 fill [1] 2972/24 final [6] 2916/1 2959/13 2959/13 2959/13	find [1] 2899/6 finding [1] 2908/28 findings [2] 2905/21 2905/22 fine [4] 2905/5 2911/8 2911/10 2911/28 finish [1] 2899/25 first [12] 2897/23 2898/5 2905/11 2918/16 2921/11 2929/26 2970/9 2971/24 2972/9 2972/13 2972/22 2973/8 fishing [1] 2909/12 fits [1] 2898/8 five [5] 2944/28 2950/15 2953/7 2956/8 2966/4 five-year [1] 2966/4 flat [1] 2974/15 flat-out [1] 2974/15 FLOOR [1] 2/15 focused [1] 2966/20	2904/28 2905/3
final [6] 2916/1	FLOOR [1] 2/15	2904/28 2905/3 2905/6 2907/7

fourth [2] 2971/26 2973/15 FRANCISCO [1] 2/5 frankly [1] 2906/15 free [2] 2902/23 2954/22 frequently [1] 2958/9 Friday [3] 2898/10 2900/7 2914/15 FULL [1] 2977/16	gibsondunn.com [1] 2/12 give [4] 2900/13 2905/27 2915/27 2974/23 given [4] 2915/14 2939/14 2939/20 2947/5 Gleam [2] 2920/5 2920/22 global [1] 2929/3 gmail.com [1] 2/6 go [14] 2899/3
---	---

go [3] 2952/11 2959/26 2967/21 goes [7] 2951/27 2959/25 2959/28 2960/10 2960/20 2969/25 2973/6 going [35] 2899/1 2900/17 2901/18 2901/26 2901/26 2901/27 2901/28 2903/3 2903/8 2903/17 2903/19 2904/2 2906/5 2906/6 2910/8 2910/9 2919/3 2924/16 2926/24 2930/18 2930/19 2931/27 2932/4 2935/1 2936/9 2938/16 2940/27 2949/24 2951/15 2951/17 2954/26 2957/15 2969/28 2973/28 2975/27 gone [2] 2927/15 2936/11 good [13] 2896/11 2896/17 2896/18 2896/20 2896/24 2899/4 2899/23 2902/9 2911/25	2912/5 2913/25 2913/26 2918/14 GORDON [2] 1/20 2896/22 got [10] 2897/17 2898/9 2898/13 2898/15 2900/26 2903/6 2908/16 2936/10 2949/11 2961/22 governance [1] 2958/27 governing [2] 2956/7 2959/6 government [1] 2909/22 GRAND [1] 2/11 Granted [1] 2922/3 gray [3] 2948/14 2948/17 2948/19 greater [2] 2939/19 2948/22 green [3] 2920/17 2948/13 2948/18 GRIMES [3] 1/22 1/23 2896/25 group [6] 2954/3 2960/4 2960/6 2963/27 2965/1 2973/7 groups [2] 2925/15 2925/16	growing [5] 2940/21 2940/21 2940/23 2941/1 2941/1 growth [3] 2939/14 2939/15 2940/12 guarantee [4] 2953/2 2956/18 2965/12 2965/15 guaranteed [4] 2951/20 2952/10 2953/13 2959/2 guess [2] 2919/28 2961/13  H had [22] 2901/25 2902/2 2903/16 2903/17 2909/19 2922/5 2925/1 2929/12 2929/24 2929/25 2931/18 2933/26 2937/18
--	---	--

H	have [98]	2903/18
happened [1]	haven't [1] 2933/28	hearsay [5]
2929/10	having [3] 2898/14	2898/17 2899/20
happening [1]	2916/13 2954/7	2899/22 2957/9
2936/16	he [32] 2900/24	2957/21
happens [2]	2900/28 2909/3	held [5] 2931/8
2950/15 2950/16	2910/3 2910/7	2932/8 2932/12
has [38] 2900/10	2910/7 2910/8	2955/9 2957/20
2901/2 2906/21	2910/18 2917/9	help [7] 2915/27
2909/23 2910/8	2926/14 2926/15	2916/4 2916/5
2912/7 2912/13	2926/19 2926/20	2920/6 2920/7
2913/1 2927/3	2926/28 2927/2	2924/3 2973/10
2927/24 2930/7	2927/3 2927/3	helpful [2] 2919/7
2932/8 2933/25	2931/15 2933/8	2919/18
2934/23 2934/23	2933/10 2933/15	helps [1] 2903/25
2936/15 2941/13	2933/16 2935/5	HENRY [2] 2/8
2941/17 2942/15	2937/8 2946/22	2897/2
2944/19 2950/22	2950/23 2955/11	her [9] 2905/15
2953/15 2953/17	2957/24 2958/11	2905/20 2912/13
2957/20 2958/2	2958/13 2958/21	2912/14 2912/15
2958/6 2960/4	2966/18	2920/1 2920/12
2963/24 2964/11	He'll [1] 2900/2	2920/14 2975/3
2965/2 2966/16	he's [8] 2910/9	here [18] 2898/28
2966/18 2969/1	2926/22 2926/23	2900/2 2900/3
2969/3 2973/7	2933/4 2941/24	2905/17 2906/16
2973/25 2974/7	2948/11 2954/21	2907/6 2907/12
2975/2	2957/26	2919/27 2922/13
hasn't [4] 2931/15	hear [3] 2901/10	2923/16 2923/17
2935/5 2935/6	2904/2 2938/13	2931/17 2931/20
2940/5	heard [2] 2930/5	2932/3 2936/16
hasn't elicited [1]	2934/25	2940/4 2941/11
2935/5	hearing [1]	2971/16
2,0010		

I identified [9] 2917/1 2918/20 2919/14 2919/23 2947/21 2950/4 2962/6 2968/1 2971/10 identify [1] 2918/12 identifying [1] 2906/17 ignored [1] 2943/5 illustrative [2] 2948/9 2948/10 immunity [1] 2905/4 impact [2] 2923/25 2942/28 implement [5] 2915/18 2954/14 2967/6 2973/12 2974/12 implemented [1] 2966/22 important [2] 2944/4 2945/26 importantly [1] 2901/2 impression [1] 2957/22 inapposite [1] 2955/6	include [3] 2905/15 2960/28 2961/6 including [2] 2919/10 2969/3 increase [2] 2940/12 2952/13 independent [2] 2924/12 2924/17 independently [1] 2924/15 indicated [2] 2964/12 2975/18 indicating [6] 2943/17 2950/14 2962/9 2962/18 2971/16 2973/25 individual [7] 2917/15 2923/3 2923/5 2924/9 2929/4 2929/8 2948/15 influence [12] 2941/13 2941/18 2941/23 2942/1 2942/5 2942/1 2942/5 2942/1 2942/5 2942/1 2942/5 2942/1 2944/19 2958/8 information [9] 2907/25 2907/28 2908/16 2910/17 2912/11 2916/10	2917/10 2945/14 2966/6 insofar [1] 2954/15 instance [1] 2907/25 instances [2] 2958/15 2959/4 instead [1] 2950/12 intending [2] 2954/7 2954/20 intent [2] 2909/23 2909/26 interchangeably [1] 2970/24 interest [3] 2915/22 2916/3 2942/15 interrupt [1] 2928/5 interrupted [1] 2914/23 intuitive [1] 2971/20 invading [2] 2905/25 2906/14 involved [2] 2955/18 2958/11 involvement [1] 2947/8 involving [1] 2955/15 irrelevant [5] 2926/10 2930/14

I	JR [1] 2/10	just [51] 2897/27
irrelevant [3]	Juan [14] 2926/1	2898/23 2899/18
2937/1 2954/4	2929/28 2930/24	2900/9 2901/14
2957/10	2930/25 2930/27	2902/10 2902/12
is [235]	2931/4 2931/9	2902/16 2902/18
is did [1] 2908/8	2931/18 2932/1	2903/6 2903/11
isn't [4] 2906/28	2932/8 2932/18	2904/4 2904/5
2907/22 2908/7	2933/5 2936/2	2905/14 2905/28
2962/25	2936/6	2906/17 2906/21
issue [12] 2898/16	JUDGE [2] 1/3	2909/10 2909/12
2905/8 2909/26	2977/3	2910/12 2910/22
2922/12 2925/16	judgment [1]	2910/24 2914/18
2926/26 2931/16	2935/22	2920/21 2926/2
2931/19 2938/11	Junior [1] 2968/7	2928/6 2930/8
2954/2 2954/3	jurisdiction [11]	2931/14 2934/23
2957/12	2916/9 2924/2	2935/4 2938/4
issues [1] 2897/21	2926/15 2926/25	2940/11 2943/21
it [159]	2927/20 2927/24	2947/13 2948/24
	2928/8 2929/19	2953/11 2954/17
it's [90]	2950/11 2950/12	2963/13 2964/1
its [6] 2905/23 2911/17 2913/2	2962/12	2965/6 2965/24
2931/5 2954/8	jurisdiction-wide	2967/5 2968/5
	[1] 2916/9	2968/19 2968/25
2963/20	jurisdictions [16]	2971/23 2971/27
itself [4] 2905/3	2922/11 2925/9	2973/2 2973/13
2918/10 2938/3	2925/14 2926/10	2973/24 2974/22
2963/16	2927/15 2927/28	JUSTIN [2] 3/4
$\mathbf{J}$	2936/22 2936/26	2926/2
Jauregui [1]	2953/18 2953/20	
2955/8	2953/24 2957/11	<u>K</u>
jaws [1] 2899/17	2958/11 2958/13	KAHN [2] 2/8
joined [1] 2910/2	2958/22 2966/19	2896/28
		Karin [1] 2908/20

K	2963/10 2971/1	Latino [61]
keep [2] 2903/13	knows [1] 2910/8	2922/13 2929/11
2908/6	Kousser's [1]	2929/13 2929/16
<b>KEVIN [2] 1/16</b>	2918/12	2929/25 2929/26
2896/18	$\overline{\mathbf{L}}$	2929/28 2930/13
Kevin Shenkman		2931/6 2931/19
[1] 2896/18	L.A [1] 2939/27 la [3] 2946/20	2931/26 2932/1
kind [4] 2905/4	2947/8 2947/16	2932/17 2932/20
2910/12 2940/11	lack [6] 2917/8	2932/21 2932/28
2951/7	2921/27 2922/1	2933/2 2934/14
kishenkman [1]	2931/15 2933/27	2934/16 2934/18
1/18	2945/12	2934/23 2935/2
know [31] 2900/2	lacks [1] 2926/14	2935/10 2935/11
2902/13 2903/9	LANCASTER [1]	2935/24 2935/28
2904/25 2905/6	1/21	2936/25 2937/13
2907/19 2907/27	large [18] 2915/28	2937/14 2937/18
2908/5 2909/16	2916/8 2921/23	2938/3 2938/7
2909/23 2910/14	2922/26 2923/12	2938/12 2938/14
2910/17 2918/8	2925/3 2927/15	2939/17 2939/17
2918/9 2929/4	2930/28 2933/7	2940/7 2940/20
2931/26 2931/27	2933/10 2933/14	2940/23 2942/23
2935/16 2936/2	2933/16 2933/23	2943/11 2943/23
2936/5 2936/7	2936/11 2937/23	2944/9 2944/12
2936/9 2936/10	2941/28 2943/1	2944/19 2944/22
2951/15 2952/3	2966/21	2945/4 2945/15
2955/3 2961/1	larger [3] 2903/9	2946/9 2946/14
2965/1 2967/4	2922/26 2939/17	2946/17 2948/23
2971/3 2971/17	largest [1] 2932/17	2948/24 2948/26
knowing [1] 2963/3		2949/3 2956/26
knowledge [2]	2898/10 2904/27	2957/17 2960/15
2910/4 2953/16	2930/14 2934/20	2965/17 2969/20
known [3] 2956/1	2941/17 2975/21	2969/26

law [7] 1/19 1/22 2/4 2906/9 2941/20 2941/22 2954/22 lay [3] 2925/22 2927/4 2928/12 learn [2] 2908/26 2947/7 learned [1] 2897/26 least [17] 2924/4 2934/15 2942/26 2947/1 2952/4 2958/5 2967/3 2910/14 let's [17] 2909/4 2914/2 2916/18 2917/11 2919/1 2921/6 2927/27 2930/24 2935/8 2930/24 2935/8 2930/16 2949/11 2940/13 2962/23 2964/17 2964/18 2965/16 2973/25 2975/10 leaves [1] 2940/13 leeway [2] 2899/15 2935/1 left [2] 2915/1 2937/9  2958/5 2967/3 2974/10 Letewis's [1] 2918/11 Lichtman [1] 2900/2 like [28] 2902/7 2900/2 2900/2 like [28] 2902/7 2908/27 2909/20 2908/27 2909/20 2923/9 2926/5 2930/24 2935/8 2930/16 2949/11 2940/13 2970/5 2973/25 2947/1 2947/25 2949/8 2968/28 2970/5 2973/25 2949/8 2968/28 2970/2 2949/8 2968/28 2970/2 2949/8 2968/28 2970/2 2949/8 2968/28 2970/2 2949/8 2949/8 2947/1 2940/13 2940/13 2940/13 2940/13 2940/13 2940/14 291/4/2 2916/18 2900/2 2	L	legislature [1]	2947/13 2947/26
2936/5 2937/27 2939/19 2945/12 2945/21 2946/21 2960/28 2961/14 law [7] 1/19 1/22 2/4 2906/9 2941/20 2941/22 2954/22 lay [3] 2925/22 2927/4 2928/12 learn [2] 2908/26 2947/7 learned [1] 2897/26 least [17] 2924/4 2934/15 2942/26 2947/1 2952/4 2954/15 2954/15 2955/28 2958/22 2960/9 2961/16 2962/23 2964/17 2966/12 2958/22 2960/9 2961/16 2962/23 2964/17 2966/12 2978/26 leaves [1] 2975/9 leaves [1] 2975/9 leaving [1] 2940/13 leeway [2] 2899/15 2935/1 left [2] 2915/1 2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8		2915/7	2950/5 2954/8
2939/19 2945/12   2916/14 2916/14   2923/4 2924/24   2960/28 2961/14   2923/4 2924/24   2941/12 2952/8   2958/5 2967/3   2974/10   let [4] 2897/6   2927/4 2928/12   learn [2] 2908/26   2947/7   learned [1] 2897/26   least [17] 2924/4   2934/15 2942/26   2947/1 2952/4   2934/15 2954/25   2947/1 2952/4   2934/15 2954/25   2955/28 2958/22   2960/9 2961/16   2962/23 2964/17   2966/23 2964/17   2966/23 2964/17   2966/23 2964/17   2966/23 2964/17   2966/23 2964/17   2966/23 2964/17   2966/23 2964/17   2966/23 2964/17   2966/23 2964/17   2966/23 2964/17   2966/23 2964/17   2966/23 2964/17   2966/23 2964/17   2966/23 2964/17   2966/23 2964/17   2966/23 2964/17   2966/23 2964/17   2966/25 2975/9   leaves [1] 2975/9   leaves [2] 2927/23   2976/25 2971/24   2976/25 2971/25   2971/25 2971/26   2976/25 2971/26   2976/25 2971/26   2976/25 2971/26   2976/25 2971/26   2976/25 2971/26   2976/26   2966/22 2926/18   2930/7 2934/23   2935/1   2936/2 2936/19   2936/24 2962/7   2966		less [10] 2916/13	2954/27 2954/28
2945/21 2946/21 2960/28 2961/14 law [7] 1/19 1/22 2/4 2906/9 2941/20 2941/22 2954/22 lay [3] 2925/22 2927/4 2928/12 learn [2] 2908/26 2947/7 learned [1] 2897/26 least [17] 2924/4 2934/15 2942/26 2947/1 2952/4 2958/5 2967/3 2910/14 let's [17] 2909/4 2914/2 2916/18 2910/14 let's [17] 2909/4 2914/2 2916/18 2900/2 like [28] 2902/7 2900/2 like [28] 2902/7 2900/2 like [28] 2902/7 2900/2 like [28] 2902/7 2908/27 2909/20 2923/9 2904/17 2908/27 2909/20 2923/9 2926/5 2930/24 2935/8 2930/24 2935/8 2930/16 2949/11 2964/18 2965/16 2962/23 2964/17 2964/18 2965/16 2973/25 2975/10 leaves [1] 2940/13 leeway [2] 2899/15 2935/1 left [2] 2915/1 2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8  2923/4 2924/24 2941/12 2952/8 2989/72 2988/27 2900/2 like [28] 2902/7 2900/2 like [28] 2902/7 2908/27 2908/27 2909/20 2923/9 2926/5 2930/16 2949/11 2958/5 2967/3 Lewis's [1] 2918/11 Lichtman [1] 2900/2 2908/27 2909/20 2908/27 2909/20 2923/9 2926/5 2930/16 2949/11 2958/5 2967/3 Lewist's [2] 2908/27 2910/14 Lichtman [1] 2900/2 2908/27 2909/20 2923/9 2926/5 2930/16 2949/11 2971/25 2971/25 2971/25 2971/26 like [28] 2902/7 2900/2 2900/2 2900/2 2900/2 2900/2 2900/2 2900/2 2908/27 2909/20 2923/9 2926/5 2930/16 2949/11 2971/25 2971/24 2971/25 2971/25 2971/24 2971/25 2971/25 2971/26 like [28] 2902/7 2900/2 2900/2 2910/14 2900/2 290		2916/14 2916/14	2955/4 2957/16
2960/28 2961/14 law [7] 1/19 1/22 2/4 2906/9 2941/20 2941/22 2954/22 lay [3] 2925/22 2927/4 2928/12 learn [2] 2908/26 2947/7 learned [1] 2897/26 least [17] 2924/4 2934/15 2942/26 2947/1 2952/4 2958/5 2967/3  2910/14 let's [17] 2909/4 2914/2 2916/18 2917/11 2919/1 2921/6 2927/27 2930/24 2935/8 2930/16 2949/11 2964/18 2965/16 2962/23 2964/17 2964/18 2965/16 2973/25 2975/10 leaves [1] 2940/13 leeway [2] 2899/15 2935/1 left [2] 2915/1 2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8  2941/12 2952/8 2958/5 2967/3 Levitt's [2] 2903/22 2925/23 Lewis's [1] 2918/11 Lichtman [1] 2900/2 like [28] 2902/7 2900/2		2923/4 2924/24	2967/23 2971/11
law [7] 1/19 1/22 2/4 2906/9 2941/20 2941/22 2954/22 lay [3] 2925/22 2927/4 2928/12 learn [2] 2908/26 2947/7 learned [1] 2897/26 least [17] 2924/4 2934/15 2942/26 2947/1 2952/4 2954/15 2954/15 2955/28 2958/22 2960/9 2961/16 2962/23 2964/17 2964/18 2965/16 2973/25 2975/10 leaves [1] 2975/9 leaving [1] 2940/13 leeway [2] 2899/15 2935/1 left [2] 2915/1 2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8  2958/5 2967/3 2974/10 let [4] 2897/6 2897/27 2898/27 2910/14 let's [17] 2909/4 2910/14 let's [17] 2909/4 2910/14 let's [17] 2909/4 2910/18 2910/19 2921/6 2927/27 2923/9 2926/5 2930/16 2949/11 2940/25 2947/1 2947/25 2947/1 2947/25 2947/1 2947/25 2949/8 2968/28 2970/5 2973/25 lets [1] 2910/10 letter [1] 2911/11 levels [2] 2927/22 2927/23 LEVITT [25] 3/4 2900/2 like [28] 2902/7 2908/27 2909/20 2923/9 2926/5 2930/16 2949/11 2956/1 2962/2 2956/1 2960/22 2956/1 2960/22 2966/12 2962/20 2971/25 2971/24 2971/25 2971/25 2971/25 2971/25 2971/25 2971/26 likely [2] 2939/16 2935/6 2936/19 2935/6 2936/19 2935/6 2936/19 2935/6 2936/19 2935/2 2926/2 2926/18 limited [25] 2961/24 2962/3 2962/2 2926/77		2941/12 2952/8	Levitt's [2] 2903/22
2/4 2906/9 2941/20 2941/22 2954/22 lay [3] 2925/22 2927/4 2928/12 learn [2] 2908/26 2947/7 learned [1] 2897/26 least [17] 2924/4 2934/15 2942/26 2947/1 2952/4 2954/15 2954/15 2955/28 2958/22 2960/9 2961/16 2962/23 2964/17 2964/18 2965/16 2973/25 2975/10 leaves [1] 2975/9 leaving [1] 2940/13 leeway [2] 2899/15 2935/1 left [2] 2915/1 2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8  2974/20 2897/27 2898/27 2910/14 lett's [17] 2909/4 2914/2 2916/18 2900/2 like [28] 2902/7 2900/2 like [28] 2902/7 2900/2 like [28] 2902/7 2904/26 2905/4 2904/26 2905/4 2904/26 2905/4 2904/26 2905/4 2904/26 2905/4 2908/27 2909/20 2923/9 2926/5 2930/24 2935/8 2938/20 2939/5 2938/20 2939/5 2947/11 2947/25 2949/8 2968/28 2970/25 2971/24 2971/25 2971/24 2971/25 2971/25 2971/25 2971/28 2972/11 2974/20 2974/26 likely [2] 2939/16 2935/6 2936/19 2935/6 2936/19 2935/6 2936/19 2935/6 2936/19 2936/24 2962/3 2962/2 2926/3		2958/5 2967/3	<del></del>
2941/22 2954/22   let [4] 2897/6   2897/27 2898/27   2900/2   like [28] 2900/2   like [28] 2902/7   2910/14   2914/2 2916/18   2904/26 2905/4   2914/2 2916/18   2904/26 2905/4   2934/15 2942/26   2947/1 2952/4   2954/15 2955/28 2958/22   2960/9 2961/16   2962/23 2964/17   2964/18 2965/16   2973/25 2975/10   leaves [1] 2975/9   leaving [1] 2940/13   leeway [2] 2899/15 2935/1   left [2] 2915/1 2937/9   legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8   2939/26		2974/10	Lewis's [1] 2918/11
lay [3] 2925/22 2927/4 2928/12		let [4] 2897/6	
2927/4 2928/12   let's [17] 2909/4   2902/23 2904/17   2904/7   2914/2 2916/18   2917/11 2919/1   2908/27 2909/20   2923/9 2926/5   2934/15 2942/26   2947/1 2952/4   2954/15 2955/28 2958/22   2960/9 2961/16   2962/23 2964/17   2964/18 2965/16   2973/25 2975/10   leaves [1] 2975/9   leaving [1] 2940/13   leeway [2] 2899/15   2935/1   left [2] 2915/1   2937/9   legal [5] 2912/22   2941/20 2942/8   2910/14   let's [17] 2909/4   2902/23 2904/17   2908/27 2909/20   2923/9 2926/5   2923/9 2926/5   2930/16 2949/11   2925/6   2930/16 2949/11   2956/1 2960/22   2956/1 2960/22   2963/15 2964/3   2970/25 2971/24   2970/25 2971/24   2971/24 2971/25   2971/25 2971/25   2927/23   2971/25 2971/28   2972/11 2974/20   2974/26   likely [2] 2939/16   2935/6 2936/19   2905/13 2961/20   2961/24 2962/3   2965/13 2961/20   2961/24 2962/3   2963/15 2961/20   2961/24 2962/3   2965/13 2961/20   2961/24 2962/3   2963/15 2961/20   2961/24 2962/3   2963/15 2961/20   2961/24 2962/3   2963/15 2961/20   2961/24 2962/3   2963/15 2961/20   2961/24 2962/3   2963/15 2961/20   2961/24 2962/3   2963/15 2961/24 2962/3   2963/15 2961/20   2961/24 2962/3   2963/15 2961/20   2961/24 2962/3   2963/15 2961/20   2961/24 2962/3   2963/15 2961/20   2961/24 2962/3   2963/15 2961/20   2961/24 2962/3   2963/15 2961/20   2961/24 2962/3   2963/15 2961/20   2963/15 2961/24 2962/3   2963/15 2963/15   2963/15 2961/20   2963/15 2963/15   2963/15 29			
learn [2] 2908/26 2947/7 learned [1] 2897/26 least [17] 2924/4 2934/15 2942/26 2947/1 2952/4 2954/15 2954/15 2955/28 2958/22 2960/9 2961/16 2962/23 2964/17 2964/18 2965/16 2973/25 2975/10 leaves [1] 2975/9 leaving [1] 2940/13 leeway [2] 2899/15 2935/1 left [2] 2915/1 2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8  let's [17] 2909/4 2914/2 2916/18 2917/11 2919/1 2923/9 2926/5 2938/20 2939/5 2938/20 2939/5 2938/20 2939/5 2947/11 2947/25 2948/2 2948/2 2949/8 2968/28 2970/5 2973/25 2949/8 2968/28 2970/5 2973/25 2949/8 2968/28 2970/5 2973/25 2949/8 2968/28 2970/5 2973/25 2949/8 2968/28 2970/5 2973/25 2949/8 2968/28 2970/5 2973/25 2911/11 levels [2] 2911/11 levels [2] 2927/22 2927/23 LEVITT [25] 3/4 2902/17 2904/3 2971/24 2971/25 2971/25 2971/28 2971/25 2971/28 2972/11 2974/20 2974/26 likely [2] 2939/16 2938/20 2914/14 2902/17 2904/3 limine [1] 2935/23 limited [25] 2905/13 2961/20 2961/24 2962/3 2961/24 2962/3		2910/14	like [28] 2902/7
2947/7 learned [1] 2897/26 least [17] 2924/4 2934/15 2942/26 2947/1 2952/4 2954/15 2954/15 2960/9 2961/16 2962/23 2964/17 2964/18 2965/16 leaves [1] 2975/9 leaving [1] 2940/13 leeway [2] 2899/15 2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8  2914/2 2916/18 2917/11 2919/1 2921/6 2927/27 2930/24 2935/8 2930/16 2949/11 2923/9 2926/5 2930/16 2949/11 2951/27 2952/20 2923/9 2926/5 2930/16 2949/11 2951/27 2952/20 2960/2 2960/22 2960/2 2961/16 2970/5 2973/25 2970/5 2973/25 2970/5 2973/25 2970/25 2971/24 2971/25 2971/24 2971/25 2971/25 2971/25 2971/28 2972/23 2972/23 2972/23 2972/23 2972/23 2972/23 2972/23 2972/23 2972/23 2972/23 2972/23 2972/25 2972/20 2972/20 2972/20 2972/20 2972/20 2972/21 2972/20 2972/21 2972/20 2972/21 2972/20 2972/21 2972/20 2972/21 2972/20 2972/21 2972/20 2972/21 2972/20 2972/21 2972/20 2972/20 2972/20 2972/21 2972/20 2972/20 2972/20 2972/20 2972/20 2972/20 2972/20 2972/20 2972/21 2972/20			
learned [1] 2897/26   2917/11 2919/1   2908/27 2909/20   2934/15 2942/26   2930/24 2935/8   2930/16 2949/11   2954/15 2954/15   2955/28 2958/22   2947/11 2947/25   2946/9 2961/16   2962/23 2964/17   2964/18 2965/16   2970/5 2973/25 2975/10   leaves [1] 2975/9   leaving [1] 2940/13   leeway [2] 2899/15   2935/1   left [2] 2915/1   2937/9   legal [5] 2912/22   2941/20 2942/8   2917/12 2939/6   2936/19 2935/6 2936/19   2961/24 2962/3   2963/4 2962/7   2961/24 2962/3   2961/24 2962/3   2961/24 2962/3   2963/4 2962/7   2961/24 2962/3   2963/4 2962/7   2961/24 2962/3   2963/4 2962/7   2961/24 2962/3   2963/4 2962/7   2961/24 2962/3   2963/4 2962/7   2961/24 2962/3   2963/4 2962/7   2961/24 2962/3   2963/4 2962/7   2961/24 2962/3   2963/4 2962/7   2961/24 2962/3   2963/4 2962/7   2961/24 2962/3   2963/4 2962/7   2961/24 2962/3   2963/4 2962/7   2961/24 2962/3   2963/4 2962/7   2961/24 2962/3   2963/4 2962/7   2961/24 2962/3   2963/4 2962/3   2963/4 2962/7   2961/24 2962/3   2963/4 2962/7   2961/24 2962/3   2963/4 2962/3   2963/4 2962/7   2963/4 2962/3   29			2904/26 2905/4
least [17] 2924/4 2934/15 2942/26 2947/1 2952/4 2955/28 2958/22 2960/9 2961/16 2962/23 2964/17 2964/18 2965/16 2973/25 2975/10 leaves [1] 2975/9 leaving [1] 2940/13 leeway [2] 2899/15 2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8  2921/6 2927/27 2930/24 2935/8 2930/16 2949/11 2951/27 2952/20 2956/1 2960/22 2946/25 2949/8 2968/28 2970/5 2973/25 2973/25 2971/24 2962/20 2962/21 2962/20 2962/12 2962/20 2963/15 2962/20 2963/15 2964/3 2970/25 2971/24 2971/25 2971/24 2971/25 2971/25 2971/25 2971/25 2971/25 2971/26 likely [2] 2939/16 2939/18 limine [1] 2935/23 limited [25] 2936/2 2926/18 2930/16 2949/11 2951/27 2952/20 2962/12 2962/20 2962/12 2962/20 2971/25 2971/24 2971/25 2		2017/11 2010/1	
2934/15 2942/26 2947/1 2952/4 2954/15 2954/15 2955/28 2958/22 2960/9 2961/16 2962/23 2964/17 2964/18 2965/16 2973/25 2975/10 leaves [1] 2975/9 leaving [1] 2940/13 leeway [2] 2899/15 2930/24 2935/8 2930/16 2949/11 2940/25 2947/11 2947/25 2949/8 2968/28 2970/5 2973/25 lets [1] 2910/10 letter [1] 2911/11 levels [2] 2927/22 2927/23 LEVITT [25] 3/4 2902/17 2904/3 2913/20 2914/14 2916/19 2922/5 2930/16 2949/11 2956/1 2960/22 2963/15 2962/20 2970/25 2971/24 2971/25 2971/25 2971/25 2971/28 2972/11 2974/20 2974/26 likely [2] 2939/16 2939/18 limine [1] 2935/23 limited [25] 2935/6 2936/19 2935/6 2936/19 2961/24 2962/3 2962/4 2962/3			
2934/15 2942/26 2947/1 2952/4 2954/15 2954/15 2955/28 2958/22 2960/9 2961/16 2962/23 2964/17 2964/18 2965/16 2973/25 2975/10 leaves [1] 2975/9 leaving [1] 2940/13 leeway [2] 2899/15 2935/1 left [2] 2915/1 2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8  2938/20 2939/5 2947/11 2947/25 2948/8 2968/28 2970/5 2973/25 2949/8 2968/28 2970/5 2973/25 2963/15 2962/20 2963/15 2962/20 2963/15 2963/15 2963/15 2963/15 2963/15 2971/24 2977/25 2927/23 LEVITT [25] 3/4 2902/17 2904/3 2913/20 2914/14 2939/18 limine [1] 2935/23 limited [25] 2935/6 2936/19 2935/6 2936/19 2935/1 2961/20 2961/24 2962/3 2962/4 2962/3			
2947/11 2952/4 2954/15 2954/15 2955/28 2958/22 2960/9 2961/16 2962/23 2964/17 2964/18 2965/16 2973/25 2975/10 leaves [1] 2940/13 leeway [2] 2899/15 2935/1 left [2] 2915/1 2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8  2947/11 2947/25 2948/8 2968/28 2970/5 2973/25 2973/25 2973/25 2970/5 2973/25 2962/12 2962/20 2963/15 2964/3 2970/25 2971/24 2970/25 2971/24 2971/25 2971/25 2971/25 2971/28 2972/11 2974/20 2972/23 LEVITT [25] 3/4 2902/17 2904/3 2916/19 2922/5 2926/2 2926/18 limited [25] 2935/6 2936/19 2962/4 2962/3 2962/4 2962/7			
2955/28 2958/22 2960/9 2961/16 2962/23 2964/17 2964/18 2965/16 2973/25 2975/10 leaves [1] 2975/9 leaving [1] 2940/13 leeway [2] 2899/15 2935/1 left [2] 2915/1 2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2949/8 2968/28 2970/5 2973/25 lets [1] 2910/10 letter [1] 2911/11 levels [2] 2927/22 2927/23 LEVITT [25] 3/4 2902/17 2904/3 2913/20 2914/14 2916/19 2922/5 2930/7 2934/23 2935/6 2936/19 2935/6 2936/19 2962/12 2962/20 2963/15 2961/24 2971/25 2971/25 2971/25 2971/25 2972/11 2974/20 2972/11 2974/20 2939/18 limine [1] 2935/23 limited [25] 2905/13 2961/20 2961/24 2962/3 2962/4 2962/7			
2955/28 2958/22 2960/9 2961/16 2962/23 2964/17 2964/18 2965/16 2973/25 2975/10 leaves [1] 2975/9 leaving [1] 2940/13 leeway [2] 2899/15 2935/1 left [2] 2915/1 2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2970/5 2973/25 lets [1] 2910/10 letter [1] 2911/11 levels [2] 2927/22 2927/23 LEVITT [25] 3/4 2902/17 2904/3 2913/20 2914/14 2916/19 2922/5 2930/7 2934/23 2935/6 2936/19 2935/6 2936/19 2963/15 2964/3 2971/25 2971/24 2971/25 2971/25 2972/11 2974/20 2974/26 likely [2] 2939/16 2939/18 limine [1] 2935/23 limited [25] 2905/13 2961/20 2961/24 2962/3 2961/24 2962/3			
2962/23 2964/17 2964/18 2965/16 2973/25 2975/10 leaves [1] 2975/9 leaving [1] 2940/13 leeway [2] 2899/15 2935/1 left [2] 2915/1 2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8  lets [1] 2910/10 letter [1] 2911/11 levels [2] 2927/22 2927/23 LEVITT [25] 3/4 2902/17 2904/3 2913/20 2914/14 2916/19 2922/5 2926/2 2926/18 2930/7 2934/23 2935/6 2936/19 2961/24 2962/3 2962/4 2962/7			
2964/18 2965/16 2973/25 2975/10 leaves [1] 2975/9 leaving [1] 2940/13 leeway [2] 2899/15 2935/1 left [2] 2915/1 2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8  letter [1] 2911/11 levels [2] 2927/22 2927/23 LEVITT [25] 3/4 2902/17 2904/3 2913/20 2914/14 2916/19 2922/5 2926/2 2926/18 2930/7 2934/23 2935/6 2936/19 2961/24 2962/3 2962/4 2962/7			
2973/25 2975/10 leaves [1] 2975/9 leaving [1] 2940/13 leeway [2] 2899/15 2935/1 left [2] 2915/1 2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8 levels [2] 2927/22 2927/23 LEVITT [25] 3/4 2902/17 2904/3 2913/20 2914/14 2939/18 limine [1] 2935/23 limited [25] 2930/7 2934/23 2935/6 2936/19 2965/4 2962/7			
leaves [1] 2975/9 leaving [1] 2940/13 leeway [2] 2899/15 2935/1 left [2] 2915/1 2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8  2927/23 LEVITT [25] 3/4 2902/17 2904/3 2913/20 2914/14 2916/19 2922/5 2936/2 2926/18 2930/7 2934/23 2935/6 2936/19 2961/24 2962/3 2962/4 2962/7		~ ~	
leaves [1] 2975/9 leaving [1] 2940/13 leeway [2] 2899/15 2935/1 left [2] 2915/1 2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8  LEVITT [25] 3/4 2902/17 2904/3 2913/20 2914/14 2939/18 limine [1] 2935/23 limited [25] 2930/7 2934/23 2935/6 2936/19 2965/13 2961/24 2962/7			
leaving [1] 2940/13 leeway [2] 2899/15 2935/1 left [2] 2915/1 2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8 2902/17 2904/3 2913/20 2914/14 2916/19 2922/5 2926/2 2926/18 2930/7 2934/23 2935/6 2936/19 2961/24 2962/3 2963/4 2962/7	<b>-</b> -	I EXITT [25] 2/4	
2935/1 left [2] 2915/1 2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8  2913/20 2914/14 2939/18 limine [1] 2935/23 limited [25] 2930/7 2934/23 2935/6 2936/19 2961/24 2962/3 2962/4 2962/7	_		
2935/1 left [2] 2915/1 2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8  2916/19 2922/5 2926/2 2926/18 2930/7 2934/23 2935/6 2936/19 2961/24 2962/3 2962/4 2962/7	<b>v</b>		
2937/9 legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8  2926/2 2926/18 2930/7 2934/23 2935/6 2936/19 2961/24 2962/3 2938/21 2939/6			
legal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8 2935/6 2936/19 2935/6 2936/19 2961/24 2962/3 2938/21 2939/6			
1egal [5] 2912/22 2941/20 2942/8 2935/6 2936/19 2961/24 2962/3 2938/21 2939/6 2962/4 2962/7	2937/9		<b>L -</b>
2941/20 2942/8 2038/21 2030/6 2062/4 2062/7	legal [5] 2912/22		
2942/10 2954/24	2941/20 2942/8		
	2942/10 2954/24	2938/21 2939/6	2902/4 2902//

L	2941/11 2941/12	Los Angeles [1]
limited [19]	2942/5 2967/3	2968/26
2962/9 2962/17	2967/4 2968/23	lose [1] 2935/25
2963/8 2963/10	2973/3 2973/12	lost [4] 2933/15
2964/10 2965/4	2974/10 2974/11	2933/16 2946/28
2966/17 2966/18	live [10] 2901/19	2972/21
2966/22 2968/28	2901/23 2901/28	lot [7] 2899/14
2969/1 2969/10	2902/15 2902/19	2900/10 2900/11
2969/14 2969/17	2902/20 2902/23	2902/28 2903/2
2969/20 2970/1	2903/15 2904/4	2903/9 2945/13
2974/26 2975/13	2925/28	love [1] 2973/26
2975/24	LLC [1] 2912/14	low [8] 2922/22
line [7] 2920/22	localized [1]	2958/6 2958/19
2921/7 2928/6	2915/26	2958/20 2958/20
2930/3 2934/22	located [1] 2921/17	2966/28 2973/27
2938/5 2948/8	log [1] 2911/12	2974/7
lines [3] 2948/14	long [4] 2908/23	lower [8] 2923/19
2948/14 2948/15	2911/5 2913/27	2924/1 2936/4
	2973/22	2940/7 2956/26
list [3] 2903/9	longer [1] 2900/24	2959/27 2968/10
2903/17 2971/27	look [7] 2927/3	2974/17
literature [3]	2927/4 2936/9	LOZA [1] 2/10
2957/1 2957/7	2936/10 2968/23	
2957/27	2971/18 2973/17	M
litigation [6]	looked [2] 2921/20	ma'am [1] 2917/20
2925/4 2927/16	2945/25	machinery [4]
2927/19 2931/2	looking [3] 2920/6	2967/6 2967/11
2953/19 2969/4	2945/13 2971/16	2967/17 2968/25
little [19] 2900/14	LOS [7] 1/2 1/24	machines [1]
2914/18 2920/21	2/12 2896/3	2915/19
2923/18 2923/19	2968/26 2977/2	made [4] 2909/13
2931/25 2934/3	2977/15	2911/1 2911/6
2935/1 2940/14		2935/22

Maybe [7] 2903/10 2903/27 2914/22 2918/14 2920/5 2961/23 2964/3 mayor [1] 2933/5 mayoral [1] 2970/25 MC [16] 2/7 2896/26 2906/1 2906/17 2907/13 2907/14 2907/15 2907/15 2907/26 2908/4 2908/20 2908/26 2909/6 2910/4 2912/12 2912/24 McDonald [2] 2904/16 2905/12 McRae [2] 2914/3 2914/4 me [12] 2897/6 2897/27 2908/27 2913/6 2913/27 2920/4 2929/14 2935/1 2946/28 2951/28 2959/8 2965/17 mean [12] 2899/23	2916/12 2944/6 2960/2 2960/23 2964/15 meantime [1] 2900/1 measures [1] 2905/22 mechanism [1] 2972/1 meet [2] 2898/27 2975/28 member [4] 2915/15 2970/25 2970/26 2973/2 members [13] 2898/3 2915/4 2915/6 2915/6 2926/6 2926/7 2956/21 2958/25 2958/27 2966/24 2966/25 2967/1 2973/11 mention [1] 2970/18	merely [2] 2942/13 2954/21 message [2] 2924/8 2924/16 method [6] 2925/10 2925/12 2926/12 2926/20 2926/27 2936/18 methods [2] 2915/12 2942/9 MICHELE [1] 2/9 mid [2] 2914/23 2956/22 mid-term [1] 2956/22 might [7] 2919/18 2920/6 2920/7 2922/28 2940/9 2954/4 2962/17 MIGUEL [1] 2/10 million [1] 2923/8 miltgrim [1] 1/24 MILTON [3] 1/22 1/23 2896/25 Milton Grimes [1] 2896/25 minorities [9] 2932/21 2951/8 2951/8 2958/6
2951/28 2959/8 2965/17	2973/11 mention [1]	minorities [9] 2932/21 2951/8

M	2921/24 2922/10 2923/15 2923/24	2896/24 2904/16 2912/5 2913/25
minority [30]	2923/27 2924/16	2913/26
2915/25 2916/3	2923/27 2924/10 2924/23 2960/7	Morrison [4]
2924/1 2925/15	MONICA [97]	2931/20 2934/25
2925/15 2926/26		2966/1 2966/13
2927/18 2939/14	Monica's [3] 2910/3 2923/22	
2942/14 2946/2		Morrison's [2]
2946/5 2946/8	2950/17	2944/27 2965/26
2951/7 2951/9	month [1] 2898/28	MOSHELL [1]
2954/2 2954/3	more [35] 2901/2	2/10
2957/12 2957/16	2902/13 2903/26	most [21] 2914/19
2960/24 2962/22	2923/5 2923/15	2914/25 2915/2
2962/26 2963/22	2924/16 2924/20	2915/3 2915/13
2963/24 2963/27	2927/17 2927/25	2915/21 2916/1
2964/7 2972/3	2934/3 2941/11	2940/3 2940/3
2973/11 2975/2	2944/19 2945/14	2951/6 2951/11
2975/4 2975/5	2946/6 2946/9	2959/2 2959/15
minute [1] 2903/23	2953/10 2956/25	2962/21 2962/24
misrepresented [1]	2960/20 2963/24	2962/25 2963/8
2936/15	2965/2 2965/4	2963/9 2963/25
mistaken [1]	2967/4 2968/25	2965/10 2972/2
2969/12	2970/4 2972/7	<b>motion [4] 2897/7</b>
misunderstood [1]	2972/8 2972/8	2904/26 2935/22
2902/4	2972/12 2972/18	2935/23
mobilize [1]	2973/7 2973/12	move [9] 2902/6
2946/22	2974/11 2974/22	2904/7 2922/2
modes [1] 2951/11	2974/23 2975/9	2930/2 2930/14
moment [2]	Moreover [1]	2934/19 2938/15
2953/20 2969/1	2930/11	2941/16 2949/8
money [12]	morning [9]	Mr [9] 2914/2
2916/13 2916/14	2896/11 2896/17	2914/4 2930/7
2916/14 2916/15	2896/18 2896/20	2934/23 2935/6

Mr [4] 2936/19 2948/7 2950/5 2971/11 Mr. [32] 2900/22 2900/27 2902/12 2903/22 2910/1 2910/2 2910/6 2910/15 2912/7 2912/13 2913/20 2926/18 2929/28 2931/20 2933/6 2933/13 2934/25 2938/28 2939/8 2939/20 2941/7 2946/20 2946/23 2946/24 2946/27 2947/8 2947/16 2948/1 2948/20 2949/2 2965/27 2966/13	Mr. Ely's [4] 2939/8 2939/20 2941/7 2949/2 Mr. Farias [2] 2933/6 2933/13 Mr. Juan [1] 2929/28 Mr. Levitt [2] 2913/20 2926/18 Mr. Levitt's [1] 2903/22 Mr. Sanders [4] 2946/23 2946/24 2946/27 2948/20 Mr. Shenkman [2] 2912/7 2912/13 Mr. Vazquez [3] 2900/22 2900/27 2902/12 Ms. [17] 2904/16 2905/12 2906/1	2907/26 2908/26 2909/6 2910/4 Ms. Mc Donald [6] 2906/1 2906/17 2907/13 2908/4 2912/12 2912/24 Ms. McDonald [2] 2904/16 2905/12 much [10] 2897/28 2915/21 2916/15 2936/6 2946/13 2946/14 2963/9 2963/9 2967/2 2970/4 multi [4] 2969/18 2970/26 2973/2 2975/7 multi-member [2] 2970/26 2973/2 multi-seat [2] 2969/18 2975/7
2926/18 2929/28 2931/20 2933/6 2933/13 2934/25 2938/28 2939/8 2939/20 2941/7 2946/20 2946/23 2946/24 2946/27 2947/8 2947/16 2948/1 2948/20 2949/2 2965/27	2903/22 Mr. Sanders [4] 2946/23 2946/24 2946/27 2948/20 Mr. Shenkman [2] 2912/7 2912/13 Mr. Vazquez [3] 2900/22 2900/27 2902/12 Ms. [17] 2904/16 2905/12 2906/1 2906/17 2907/13 2907/14 2907/15	2936/6 2946/13 2946/14 2963/9 2963/9 2967/2 2970/4 multi [4] 2969/18 2970/26 2973/2 2975/7 multi-member [2] 2970/26 2973/2 multi-seat [2] 2969/18 2975/7 mutual [1] 2900/6 my [23] 2899/10
2910/6 2910/15 Mr. de la Torre [1] 2946/20 Mr. de la Torre's [2] 2947/8 2947/16 Mr. Ely [6] 2931/20 2934/25 2938/28 2948/1 2965/27 2966/13	2907/15 2907/26 2908/4 2908/26 2909/6 2910/4 2912/12 2912/24 2920/10 2920/11 Ms. Davis [2] 2920/10 2920/11 Ms. Mc [7] 2907/14 2907/15 2907/15	2910/1 2916/22 2927/12 2930/3 2935/15 2938/5 2939/28 2940/5 2940/14 2953/4 2956/8 2957/22 2973/6 2973/6 2973/23 2973/26 2974/1 2974/2

M	2909/11	2903/7 2909/26
my [4] 2974/6	needing [2]	2911/9 2926/23
2975/21 2975/22	2916/14 2924/22	2931/7 2943/5
2975/22	needs [3] 2905/14	2957/26 2961/4
	2927/2 2972/16	2972/15 2972/23
N	neighborhood [11]	2977/7
N.F [1] 2921/13	1/4 2896/10 2940/2	non [8] 2935/11
name [5] 2896/2	2940/3 2945/21	2937/13 2943/8
2907/26 2914/2	2946/8 2946/19	2943/15 2943/28
2920/1 2968/20	2946/25 2948/11	2944/6 2944/15
named [1] 2912/13	2961/11 2977/5	2944/15
natural [1] 2907/22	neighborhoods [1]	non-Hispanic [4]
naturally [2]	2940/2	2943/28 2944/6
2915/16 2938/2	neither [1] 2929/19	2944/15 2944/15
near [1] 2936/24	net [1] 2941/2	non-Latino [2]
necessarily [1]	never [2] 2926/18	2935/11 2937/13
2965/1	2930/18	non-White [2]
necessary [1]	new [2] 2971/3	2943/8 2943/15
2902/21	2971/6	none [3] 2906/24
need [22] 2902/9	newspaper [4]	2925/16 2943/23
2905/7 2905/10	2907/27 2947/9	nonsuit [1] 2935/23
2909/5 2909/17	2947/14 2947/22	Noon [1] 2976/10
2910/13 2911/11	newspapers [2]	not [102]
2911/12 2911/13	2908/2 2908/15	noted [1] 2912/7
2913/27 2924/4	next [6] 2908/8	nothing [2] 2901/3
2928/19 2936/7	2919/3 2919/5	2936/27
2942/18 2949/12	2930/15 2976/1	notwithstanding [1]
2951/11 2960/20	2976/12	2940/26
2961/4 2965/12	night [1] 2897/26	now [11] 2898/19
2969/26 2971/22	no [17] 1/7 1/27	2899/23 2903/18
2973/13	2898/13 2899/24	2904/23 2920/26
needed [2] 2905/28	2899/27 2900/24	2933/4 2939/19

|--|

O	2964/25 2964/26	2944/4 2949/2
	2965/5 2965/6	2957/20 2960/14
one [78] 2904/6	2965/14 2965/16	2960/18 2969/19
2904/10 2904/11	2967/5 2967/25	2969/23
2906/20 2910/27	2968/9 2968/15	opinions [3]
2915/25 2921/12	2969/18 2970/24	2925/23 2941/19
2929/9 2932/12	2971/17 2972/27	2945/22
2932/14 2934/15	2975/6 2975/10	opponent [1]
2936/23 2938/26	2975/18	2901/21
2942/24 2942/27		
2943/22 2943/27	one-seat [1] 2972/27	opportunity [11] 2899/14 2922/6
2944/13 2946/3		
2946/11 2947/11	only [19] 2898/3	2925/1 2927/18
2947/14 2948/9	2900/21 2903/4	2927/19 2927/25
2950/26 2951/2	2903/18 2906/26	2941/14 2944/10
2951/3 2951/20	2909/27 2913/9	2958/7 2963/28
2951/28 2952/1	2933/2 2935/20	2974/16
2952/4 2952/26	2938/14 2945/28	opposed [1]
2952/27 2952/28	2952/1 2961/10	2911/17
2953/7 2953/11	2962/17 2963/14	opposing [1]
2953/24 2958/10	2964/24 2964/25	2917/24
2959/22 2960/1	2972/15 2974/25	opposition [4]
2960/2 2960/7	open [2] 2964/27	2951/13 2951/28
2960/9 2960/25	2967/5	2952/7 2953/9
2961/14 2961/15	operate [1] 2926/21	order [14] 2904/18
2962/18 2962/23	operating [1]	2905/7 2911/15
2963/13 2963/15	2926/28	2911/25 2924/25
2963/16 2963/16	opine [1] 2942/10	2927/4 2956/3
2963/23 2963/28	opining [1] 2926/24	2956/14 2956/24
2964/1 2964/3	opinion [14] 2901/2	2956/25 2965/12
2964/4 2964/9	2922/20 2922/25	2969/5 2971/27
2964/15 2964/18	2923/25 2926/20	2973/24
2964/18 2964/24	2927/3 2941/6	ordered [8]
<i>47</i> 07/10 <i>47</i> 04/ <i>4</i> 4		

O	2926/4 2926/19	outcome [5]
ordered [8]	2927/4 2927/14	2941/15 2942/16
2953/15 2953/18	2928/16 2930/5	2942/19 2952/14
2954/16 2956/23	2930/21 2936/1	2952/15
2969/1 2969/10	2940/24 2942/24	outlined [1]
2969/13 2969/17	2942/26 2943/8	2910/11
	2943/15 2943/17	outlining [1]
organization [11] 2915/24 2924/18	2943/23 2951/22	2948/8
	2952/7 2952/19	outside [6] 2898/17
2927/22 2945/20	2961/1 2961/2	2909/10 2910/23
2945/25 2945/28	2962/27 2966/16	2922/17 2961/14
2946/2 2947/1	2968/6 2970/26	2961/15
2947/3 2948/23	2971/28 2975/1	over [20] 2900/15
2955/23	others [3] 2915/17	2905/27 2931/25
organizations [2]	2951/3 2966/18	2939/11 2939/13
2917/23 2924/15	otherwise [2]	2940/20 2944/28
organized [5]	2921/17 2975/20	2949/4 2949/5
2915/26 2946/3	our [12] 2898/16	2952/27 2953/7
2946/5 2946/9	2898/22 2900/6	2960/15 2961/17
2960/26	2900/10 2900/18	2963/6 2963/16
organizing [1]	2902/16 2902/21	2965/9 2969/20
2947/5	2903/5 2904/18	2972/27 2972/28
original [1]	2913/5 2936/15	2974/27
2897/10	2976/1	overall [2] 2920/10
other [43] 2900/27	out [14] 2899/8	2929/6
2901/16 2902/1	2900/2 2900/6	
2904/4 2905/9	2900/2 2900/0 2907/25	overrule [2] 2927/5 2932/4
2909/10 2909/27		
2915/7 2915/26	2908/1 2908/28	Overruled [6]
2922/10 2922/11	2910/15 2916/10	2922/15 2937/2
2922/22 2923/21	2917/26 2924/16	2941/26 2942/12
2923/22 2923/22	2964/1 2968/9	2955/11 2957/28
2925/9 2925/20	2974/15	own [2] 2942/20

0	2930/17 2930/20	2952/26 2958/3
own [1] 2975/3	2954/12 2955/2	2958/12 2970/2
	paper [4] 2948/17	parts [1] 2915/26
P	2948/19 2949/22	party [1] 2901/21
p.m [1] 2976/11	2949/24	past [1] 2909/23
page [16] 2896/7	PARRIS [3] 1/19	pattern [2] 2925/2
2918/16 2919/1	1/19 1/20	2927/24
2919/5 2919/6	part [7] 2898/7	patterns [2]
2919/17 2919/20	2899/10 2904/27	2939/14 2939/15
2919/27 2920/8	2915/25 2925/25	PAUSE [2] 2914/7
2921/2 2921/6	2946/3 2952/17	2971/14
2921/10 2952/19	partially [2]	pay [1] 2924/22
2952/21 2968/10	2901/27 2901/28	PC [1] 1/15
2976/12	particular [26]	people [15] 2901/5
Page 5 [5] 2919/1	2901/7 2907/25	2910/7 2912/10
2919/6 2919/27	2915/24 2920/8	2915/9 2916/11
2920/8 2921/2	2926/1 2929/9	2922/28 2923/4
Page 8 [3] 2919/20	2929/17 2929/18	2923/5 2923/14
2921/6 2921/10	2929/22 2940/1	2953/11 2957/19
pages [4] 1/26	2943/12 2943/16	2959/18 2962/15
2919/7 2952/22	2945/24 2946/1	2972/25 2973/13
2977/16	2946/8 2946/13	per [1] 2953/11
PALAZUELOS [3]	2948/23 2951/1	percent [71] 2930/7
1/3 2896/4 2977/3	2955/1 2961/11	2930/10 2931/18
Palmdale [18]	2961/12 2963/23	2931/22 2931/25
2926/5 2928/1	2968/16 2971/23	2931/28 2932/21
2928/9 2928/10	2974/27 2975/6	2932/25 2933/2
2928/13 2928/15	particularly [12]	2933/3 2934/27
2928/23 2928/27	2915/20 2915/21	2935/17 2935/17
2929/2 2929/4	2916/2 2924/1	2935/18 2935/20
2929/15 2930/4	2924/14 2940/15	2937/6 2937/9
2930/8 2930/11	2946/3 2946/4	2938/9 2941/9
	l	

P	2939/11	phonetic [1] 2901/6
percent [52]	perfect [2] 2952/3	photos [1] 2976/7
2941/10 2941/27	2953/5	phrase [3] 2941/23
2944/1 2944/18	perfectly [6]	2941/25 2942/4
2944/19 2944/20	2951/14 2951/21	picky [1] 2931/24
2945/1 2945/5	2951/22 2952/6	PICO [10] 1/4
2945/7 2951/19	2953/3 2953/10	2896/2 2896/10
2952/3 2952/8	performance [3]	2940/3 2945/21
2952/9 2952/17	2925/2 2957/1	2946/7 2946/19
2952/18 2953/1	2975/3	2946/25 2948/11
2953/3 2953/6	performed [3]	2977/5
2953/8 2953/12	2932/2 2935/3	place [10] 2940/15
2958/24 2958/24	2936/13	2948/27 2966/19
2958/28 2959/1	perhaps [5]	2968/13 2972/13
2959/5 2959/5	2900/13 2903/14	2972/14 2972/18
2959/9 2959/21	2944/14 2967/20	2972/22 2972/23
2959/28 2960/5	2967/20	2973/15
2960/21 2963/24	period [1] 2939/13	places [6] 2925/20
2965/2 2965/15	permissible [1]	2927/4 2936/1
2965/19 2965/28	2963/16	2938/11 2958/3
2966/11 2966/28	permitted [3]	2966/16
2969/26 2970/3	2965/8 2965/9	Plaintiff [2]
2972/8 2972/9	2965/15	2896/25 2898/2
2972/11 2972/12	person [10]	plaintiffs [20] 1/6
2972/13 2972/18	2909/28 2963/14	1/15 2/4 2896/16
2972/28 2972/28	2968/9 2971/24	2896/19 2896/21
2973/7 2973/27	2971/25 2971/25	2896/23 2897/27
2974/18 2974/19	2971/26 2973/1	2898/12 2899/8
percentage [3]	2973/8 2973/15	2899/24 2901/3
2931/27 2939/19	personal [2] 2910/4	2903/22 2906/16
2973/27	2920/1	2908/28 2909/19
percentages [1]	petty [1] 2898/24	2911/10 2911/11
Per centuges [1]		

Plaintiffs [2] 2954/5 2977/7 PLAINTIFFS' [9] 3/3 2897/13 2901/21 2935/5 2936/14 2936/19 2954/19 2954/22 2955/7 plan [5] 2903/16 2939/9 2941/7 2942/26 2944/5 planning [1] 2903/10 play [11] 2898/12 2898/25 2899/8 2899/24 2900/27 2901/21 2902/12 2902/25 2903/19 2903/23 2904/9 playing [1] 2903/26 please [10] 2914/28 2916/18 2919/1 2921/6 2938/20 2939/5 2947/12 2947/25 2961/24	'YAN'YAN'    'YAN'YAN'\YAN	2941/10 2941/10 2941/14 2941/28 2942/1 2942/14 2942/15 2942/24 2942/27 2942/27 2943/11 2943/28 2944/7 2944/23 2945/3 2945/5 2954/2 2956/26 2957/12 2957/16 2957/17 2957/18 2958/14 2958/16 2958/17 2958/18 2958/23 2964/26 2964/28 2965/17 2965/24 2965/24 2965/25 2966/7 2966/25 2969/26 populations [12] 2925/15 2926/26 2940/25 2943/1 2943/4 2943/9 2943/15 2943/17 2943/23 2958/14 2959/4 2966/27 Port [12] 2953/22
please [10] 2914/28 2916/18 2919/1 2921/6 2938/20	2929/11 2929/20 2929/25 2930/13 2931/6 2931/19 2932/22 2932/23 2932/26 2934/16 2934/18 2934/24 2934/24 2935/11 2936/25 2939/15 2939/16 2939/17	2943/4 2943/9 2943/15 2943/17 2943/23 2958/14 2959/4 2966/27

P	2948/2 2948/6	2937/14
portion [3] 2916/8	2948/13 2948/16	prevailing [1]
2929/25 2965/11	2948/18	2924/14
portions [2]	prefer [2] 2964/26	prevents [1]
2900/27 2901/22	2974/27	2898/26
position [1]	preference [3]	previous [2] 2933/7
2912/22	2961/25 2973/14	2933/10
possible [16]	2974/2	previously [2]
2924/19 2931/21	preferences [7]	2928/3 2941/18
2934/26 2934/26	2951/7 2951/9	previously testified
2938/7 2938/8	2962/22 2972/3	[1] 2928/3
2947/1 2953/12	2973/10 2974/16	primary [4]
2960/23 2960/26	2975/1	2946/12 2946/16
2966/2 2966/4	prepare [1]	2946/27 2948/2
2966/7 2966/9	2905/18	Prior [2] 2937/18
2967/16 2968/24	prepared [2]	2956/10
possibly [1] 2904/4	2916/22 2938/28	privilege [6] 2905/8
potential [2]	present [3] 2901/14	2905/26 2906/4
2938/26 2938/28	2907/11 2969/25	2906/23 2908/22
potentially [2]	presentation [5]	2909/8
2941/11 2941/11	2905/18 2905/19	privileged [3]
power [6] 2922/13	2905/20 2907/19	2908/13 2911/17
2949/3 2960/15	2911/6	2913/7
2961/14 2969/20	presented [1]	probably [2]
2974/23	2909/25	2930/17 2931/13
powerful [2]	preservation [2]	procedures [1]
2915/21 2947/5	2899/12 2901/11	2955/27
Practices [1]	presidential [4]	<b>PROCEEDINGS</b>
2916/24	2947/6 2948/2	[4] 1/10 2914/7
precinct [2] 2948/2	2950/17 2956/22	2971/14 2977/17
2948/15	prevailed [3]	process [1] 2898/6
precincts [5]	2933/1 2933/4	produce [2]

0	2951/24 2953/5	2924/23 2924/26
questioning [2]	2962/26	Read [2] 2907/10
2934/22 2938/5	racially [1] 2951/25	2907/10
questions [16]	RAE [2] 2/7	reading [1]
2904/28 2905/3	2896/26	2904/25
2904/28 2903/3	raise [1] 2916/14	reads [1] 2904/26
2905/9 2905/16	raised [4] 2908/3	really [5] 2943/24
2905/9 2905/10 2905/24 2906/8	2920/11 2920/13	2952/25 2971/26
2905/24 2900/8	2924/9	2974/7 2975/2
2906/11 2900/21 2906/25 2907/7	ran [2] 2933/10	reason [3] 2915/4
2900/23 2907/7	2933/13	2916/1 2964/21
2910/1 2910/22	range [5] 2937/9	reasonable [1]
	2939/13 2965/20	2908/24
quite [9] 2915/13 2922/26 2923/9	2965/28 2966/27	reasons [3] 2930/13
2946/9 2958/9	rank [2] 2971/23	2936/7 2969/25
2958/13 2958/18	2973/24	rebuttal [1]
2967/6 2969/28	ranked [8] 2970/5	2903/14
2907/0 2909/20	2970/8 2970/9	recall [14] 2898/2
R	2970/21 2971/1	2900/16 2914/16
race [19] 2900/23	2971/11 2971/19	2914/20 2914/25
2920/9 2920/16	2973/9	2927/8 2929/1
2921/5 2921/24	rankings [1]	2929/3 2929/5
2923/1 2923/8	2973/18	2929/8 2933/10
2923/10 2956/18	rate [2] 2936/6	2966/12 2970/16
2962/20 2964/23	2940/23	2970/18
2965/3 2968/26	rather [3] 2924/21	recalls [1] 2925/27
2970/25 2970/26	2926/19 2950/12	recap [1] 2914/18
2972/27 2973/2	raw [1] 2965/24	receipts [1]
2973/5 2975/7	Re [3] 2918/21	2917/25
races [3] 2922/7	2919/14 2919/24	received [1]
2923/4 2923/5	reach [5] 2916/8	2918/27
racial [4] 2951/7	2924/4 2924/7	recent [2] 2902/8

report [8] 2910/21 2910/22 2911/6 2911/9 2911/12 2911/16 2912/1 2913/10 reported [3] 1/27 2908/3 2921/16 REPORTER [4] 1/28 2896/5 2977/13 2977/26 REPORTER's [2] 1/10 2977/8 represent [3] 2939/12 2948/15 2959/11 represented [4] 2899/24 2923/19 2923/20 2955/20 represents [1] 2959/12 reprogramming [1] 2967/14 require [1] 2967/14 required [3] 2904/22 2910/25	2967/3 2967/16 2967/17 Research [2] 2905/15 2912/14 reside [1] 2926/16 resolve [1] 2897/28 resolves [1] 2963/16 respect [5] 2904/16 2930/20 2966/14 2930/20 2966/14 2966/17 2975/14 respectfully [2] 2926/23 2936/14 respects [2] 2928/15 2928/16 respond [4] 2904/22 2929/23 2942/18 2947/4 response [7] 2897/12 2897/13 2897/15 2901/14 2904/22 2926/2 2931/2 responses [2] 2896/13 2904/19 rest [7] 2902/16 2903/22 2939/15	2937/12 2942/20 2943/2 2943/7 2966/22 results [4] 2916/21 2927/26 2948/1 2948/24 resworn [1] 2913/27 retained [10] 2905/12 2907/13 2907/14 2907/14 2907/16 2912/12 2912/14 2912/20 2912/26 2913/1 retention [3] 2910/5 2912/16 2912/18 review [4] 2898/11 2899/5 2956/28 2957/3 reviewed [3] 2912/8 2912/9 2947/14 Revised [1] 2897/7 revisit [2] 2898/25 2898/27 REX [1] 1/19
2967/14 require [1] 2967/14 required [3]	2931/2 responses [2] 2896/13 2904/19 rest [7] 2902/16	2947/14 Revised [1] 2897/7 revisit [2] 2898/25 2898/27

R	roughly [3]	2963/17 2965/14
right [25]	2922/28 2939/4	2965/20 2965/27
2897/22 2898/19	2945/19	2967/1 2969/16
2898/21 2900/4	RPR [2] 1/27	2969/25 2970/21
2901/21 2902/5	2977/26	2970/27 2972/7
2903/1 2904/24	Rs [1] 2971/17	2973/4 2974/13
2913/6 2913/23	RUBIN [3] 2/4 2/4	sample [1] 2968/2
2920/25 2926/4	2896/16	SAN [13] 2/5
2931/4 2945/9	rule [4] 2898/7	2930/24 2930/25
2945/9 2949/22	2901/7 2901/9	2930/27 2931/4
	2938/10	2931/9 2931/18
2949/25 2949/28	ruled [3] 2898/9	2932/1 2932/8
2950/27 2957/25	2899/6 2941/18	2932/17 2933/5
2960/8 2968/10	run [6] 2916/13	2936/2 2936/6
2971/18 2975/14	2923/28 2933/6	Sanchez [1]
2976/4	2953/10 2967/16	2957/20
right-hand [1]	2968/24	Sanctions [1]
2968/10	<b>RUTGER</b> [1] 1/20	2897/7
rights [11] 2925/4 2928/26 2929/23	$\overline{\mathbf{S}}$	Sanders [8]
		2946/21 2946/23
2953/16 2954/14	said [13] 2898/14	2946/24 2946/27
2954/16 2955/15	2901/10 2902/7	2947/8 2947/17
2956/10 2966/23	2903/17 2906/28	2948/20 2948/20
2969/2 2969/11 DMD [2] 1/27	2910/28 2913/12	SANTA [100]
RMR [2] 1/27	2926/18 2928/22	Santa Monica [57]
2977/26	2928/25 2954/13	2900/25 2908/2
ROAD [1] 1/17	2955/1 2958/19	2916/16 2917/16
ROBERT [3] 2/4	same [23] 2909/19	2917/16 2917/17
2/4 2896/16	2918/10 2924/24	2917/28 2921/25
robertrubinsf [1]	2926/11 2927/12	2922/8 2922/11
2/6	2936/22 2940/6	2922/14 2922/21
room [2] 2962/22	2944/25 2945/17	2922/23 2922/27
2973/21	2956/24 2956/25	

G	• 1 [12] 201 [14	[121]
S	single [12] 2915/14	so [131]
shows [4] 2916/20	2944/17 2947/4	socioeconomic [3]
2924/9 2947/27	2964/23 2964/23	2916/2 2924/2
2948/1	2969/17 2970/19	2940/8
sic [2] 2901/6	2970/25 2971/1	socioeconomics [1]
2919/16	2975/16 2975/19	2927/23
side [10] 2898/6	2975/24	solely [2] 2942/17
2898/23 2922/21	situated [1]	2942/20
2922/22 2923/10	2939/18	solution [1]
2924/18 2951/22	situation [2]	2902/18
	2951/24 2964/8	some [30] 2899/6
2951/22 2952/7	situations [1]	2900/6 2900/7
2968/10	2938/14	2902/9 2904/3
significant [1]	six [2] 2950/15	2916/5 2923/18
2924/12	2968/12	2923/19 2924/3
similar [11] 2922/7	six-year [1]	2924/10 2927/2
2924/17 2928/9	2968/12	2930/27 2934/12
2928/10 2928/16		
2958/18 2958/27	sizable [1] 2943/24	2940/11 2942/28
2965/27 2966/17	size [11] 2921/25	2944/8 2948/2
2975/13 2975/24	2922/7 2922/22	2948/3 2948/6
similarly [5]	2922/27 2923/6	2948/7 2949/12
2920/17 2945/12	2923/22 2929/3	2956/20 2956/22
2962/10 2962/28	2929/6 2930/12	2957/15 2958/5
2973/3	2935/6 2954/3	2965/4 2969/4
simple [1] 2948/1	skeptical [1]	2969/5 2973/11
simple [1] 2946/11 simply [7] 2916/11	2945/14	2976/7
2918/1 2941/22	small [3] 2921/16	somebody [3]
2942/20 2954/28	2948/13 2958/13	2959/15 2967/4
	smaller [3] 2916/11	2975/28
2957/26 2962/13	2916/11 2953/19	somehow [1]
since [4] 2913/4	smgov.net [1] 2/16	2908/21
2913/14 2913/16	snatch [1] 2899/17	someone [1] 2903/5
2974/22		

Something [5] 2924/25 2933/3 2955/4 2962/11 2967/7 something percent [1] 2933/3 Sometimes [1] 2970/24 somewhere [3] 2926/5 2932/23 2936/10 sorry [14] 2897/23 2902/3 2920/2 2928/5 2929/13 2902/3 2920/2 2928/5 2929/13 2929/18 2931/10 2943/10 2948/5 2955/9 2962/24 2963/4 2963/12 2970/7 sort [5] 2905/4 2905/26 2914/14 2915/15 2943/6	speak [2] 2926/14 2957/10 speaking [1] 2950/9 speaks [1] 2946/28 specific [2] 2915/23 2957/21 speculation [1] 2926/13 spend [8] 2923/4 2923/5 2924/23 2950/23 2950/28 2951/2 2968/16 2968/21 spending [2] 2921/21 2924/15 spent [16] 2916/16 2918/27 2920/9 2920/11 2920/13 2921/5 2921/24 2922/6 2922/10 2922/20 2923/1 2923/7 2923/8 2923/15 2923/24	2956/11 stand [1] 2921/13 standard [1] 2962/15 standards [2] 2941/20 2942/10 stark [1] 2924/10 start [5] 2897/20 2950/7 2961/23 2961/27 2976/1 started [2] 2909/4 2914/9 starting [3] 2905/11 2919/6 2919/16 starts [2] 2898/8 2919/19 state [5] 1/1 2900/23 2915/7 2977/1 2977/14 statement [1] 2941/17 statements [2] 2916/23 2917/3
2943/10 2948/5 2955/9 2962/24 2963/4 2963/12 2970/7 sort [5] 2905/4 2905/26 2914/14	2918/27 2920/9 2920/11 2920/13 2921/5 2921/24 2922/6 2922/10 2922/20 2923/1 2923/7 2923/8 2923/15 2923/24 2923/27	state [5] 1/1 2900/23 2915/7 2977/1 2977/14 statement [1] 2941/17 statements [2]

supervisors [1] 2915/8 support [9] 2916/14 2948/25 2963/23 2972/16 2972/17 2972/22 2973/2 2974/7 2975/22 supporting [2] 2917/23 2918/4 suppose [1] 2902/6 Supreme [2] 2941/12 2941/17 sure [18] 2901/12 2904/21 2919/17 2928/9 2928/20 2930/19 2935/14 2937/8 2949/13 2949/19 2952/22 2953/4 2956/24 2959/15 2961/21 2961/25 2963/26 2971/3 surname [1] 2933/3 surrounding [1] 2916/4 survey [4] 2939/11 2944/28 2966/5 2966/11 sustain [3] 2928/10	Sustained [2] 2922/1 2934/3 swing [2] 2942/19 2944/13 switch [2] 2930/28 2938/2 switched [5] 2925/3 2925/9 2926/27 2933/22 2937/23 system [25] 2925/3 2925/4 2933/14 2933/16 2933/17 2933/26 2934/8 2936/12 2949/4 2949/5 2950/8 2950/10 2950/13 2950/13 2950/21 2953/1 2958/4 2960/15 2961/4 2961/17 2962/21 2969/21 2970/15 2971/19 2974/19 systems [7] 2915/12 2915/15 2955/26 2958/10 2965/4 2972/1 2974/12  T table [4] 2924/9 2939/7 2941/5 2944/1 take [8] 2907/27	2908/8 2924/16 2972/15 2972/20 2973/1 2974/1 2976/7 taken [7] 2899/13 2905/22 2917/25 2939/11 2948/27 2976/10 2977/18 takes [2] 2973/9 2974/5 taking [2] 2898/16 2965/28 talk [7] 2897/19 2910/7 2916/12 2927/27 2930/24 2938/11 2970/5 talked [3] 2898/5 2906/7 2959/9 talking [4] 2914/15 2914/19 2943/8 2948/21 tallied [3] 2968/27 2972/4 2972/6 tallies [2] 2959/13 2968/25 tally [3] 2965/12 2972/27 2974/9 target [1] 2942/14 team [1] 2973/6 teams [1] 2900/6 technical [1]

$\mathbf{T}$	2961/8 2973/24	2937/26 2937/26
their [33] 2903/4	2974/23	2937/28 2939/18
	then [30] 2900/5	2939/23 2939/26
2903/8 2904/8	2900/9 2901/23	2939/26 2940/5
2907/23 2917/25	2902/15 2902/16	2941/5 2945/24
2917/25 2917/25	2902/25 2903/21	2945/26 2954/9
2926/12 2942/20	2903/26 2904/3	2958/22 2960/1
2951/14 2952/2	2904/18 2904/27	2963/27 2964/26
2953/11 2955/10	2905/16 2907/5	2966/21 2966/24
2958/26 2959/6	2908/8 2908/11	2967/5 2968/6
2960/7 2961/7	2909/1 2909/25	2968/14 2970/16
2963/23 2963/26	2917/11 2919/17	2970/23 2971/21
2964/4 2964/15	2926/17 2933/16	2972/5 2972/10
2964/28 2966/27	2938/15 2950/17	there's [27] 2899/1
2970/23 2971/23	2954/20 2955/1	2899/23 2904/27
2972/22 2972/23	2959/24 2965/1	2908/13 2908/18
2973/2 2973/17	2972/18 2973/28	2908/19 2909/17
2973/18 2974/14	2974/7	2916/2 2924/12
2974/28 2975/8	thenry [1] 2/12	2930/18 2940/6
them [30] 2898/9	there [51] 2899/27	2940/8 2940/11
2898/11 2898/12	2904/19 2906/11	2940/14 2941/8
2898/12 2898/13	2907/25 2908/1	2946/1 2951/10
2898/26 2898/27	2909/9 2910/16	2958/4 2960/5
2898/28 2899/8	2910/22 2912/24	2961/4 2962/26
2899/14 2902/18	2915/23 2921/4	2963/1 2963/3
2902/20 2902/23	2921/15 2923/2	2964/15 2965/14
2903/3 2903/6	2923/3 2923/5	2974/22 2975/23
2903/15 2903/15	2924/10 2925/13	therefore [2]
2907/10 2915/10	2927/21 2927/24	2900/24 2931/23
2918/4 2918/12	2929/9 2931/5	these [18] 2899/1
2924/10 2940/15	2934/16 2935/8	2900/27 2901/10
2943/19 2952/2	2935/27 2936/20	2905/24 2906/7
2959/21 2961/8	AJOUAL AJOUAU	

	Too [3] 2910/19 2952/19 2966/24 took [5] 2900/16 2908/5 2908/24 2909/25 2968/13 top [4] 2918/24 2919/28 2921/2 2921/7 Torre [1] 2946/20 Torre's [2] 2947/8 2947/16 total [14] 2900/19 2918/26 2920/5 2920/9 2920/11 2920/13 2920/16 2920/19 2920/20 2921/4 2921/21 2960/27 2962/13 2973/28 totals [6] 2918/25 2920/15 2921/3 2973/28 totals [6] 2918/25 2920/15 2921/3 2921/9 2921/15 2923/9 town [1] 2958/24 towns [2] 2958/25 2966/21 TRANSCRIPT [2] 1/10 2977/17 transferable [4] 2970/19 2971/2 2975/17 2975/19	transferred [1] 2975/22 translate [1] 2926/11 transparent [1] 2974/10 trend [2] 2927/24 2940/19 trends [1] 2940/22 trial [6] 1/11 2898/5 2900/12 2900/17 2954/13 2955/3 triggered [1] 2927/18 true [2] 2927/21 2977/17 truly [1] 2899/7 trustee [1] 2956/21 trustees [1] 2958/26 try [3] 2903/13 2927/12 2975/10 trying [8] 2899/16 2899/18 2900/21 2904/1 2906/16 2910/25 2935/26 2954/10 TUESDAY [2] 1/12 2896/3 turn [2] 2961/20 2968/28	turnout [3] 2927/23 2942/21 2944/13 turns [1] 2910/15 Twenty [1] 2952/9 Twenty percent [1] 2952/9 two [15] 2908/2 2943/4 2945/4 2951/2 2951/3 2958/22 2962/18 2968/9 2968/11 2968/21 2968/21 2970/23 2971/17 2975/9 2975/9 two-year [1] 2968/11 TWOMEY [1] 2/11 typed [1] 2918/7 types [1] 2918/5 typically [2] 2916/16 2943/7  U uh [2] 2950/2 2973/16 uh-huh [2] 2950/2 2973/16 ultimately [1] 2956/2 uncertain [1] 2939/16
--	---	---	---

$\mathbf{U}$	2901/18 2928/12	use [6] 2905/4
under [21] 2910/10	unnecessary [2]	2909/21 2952/19
2913/28 2929/23	2906/15 2911/14	2952/21 2953/20
2935/28 2938/12	unqualified [1]	2973/20
2940/4 2951/11	2901/2	used [4] 2915/19
2953/5 2954/6	unstaggered [1]	2970/24 2970/24
2954/12 2958/3	2956/15	2970/26
2959/2 2959/15	unsurprisingly [1]	useful [2] 2915/20
2960/19 2963/2	2940/22	2918/13
2963/25 2964/8	until [1] 2976/10	using [2] 2915/18
2965/10 2968/13	unusual [2]	2967/6
2970/1 2974/23	2923/11 2968/23	usual [2] 2923/15
understand [18]	up [29] 2897/18	2968/25
2899/16 2901/9	2897/23 2902/26	usually [1] 2961/4
2909/28 2913/28	2903/28 2916/18	$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$
2915/5 2915/9	2918/24 2923/2	
2920/23 2921/14	2938/20 2947/11	vague [3] 2921/27
2930/19 2931/17	2950/14 2950/16	2922/14 2931/13
2939/20 2944/25	2950/22 2951/28	VAP [8] 2930/7
2946/7 2946/20	2952/2 2952/11	2930/9 2933/2
2948/10 2965/5	2956/25 2959/1	2934/2 2934/27
2972/26 2973/13	2960/1 2960/6	2935/28 2936/24
understanding [9]	2960/21 2962/15	2937/6
2910/2 2913/5	2963/6 2963/14	varies [1] 2923/16
2932/16 2939/7	2964/3 2967/1	various [4] 2918/3
2939/28 2940/6	2967/21 2968/8	2939/8 2950/22
2940/14 2941/23	2970/2 2972/24	2955/25
2941/24 2941/24	us [7] 2898/15	vast [1] 2904/26
	2899/24 2909/9	Vazquez [8]
understood [1] 2943/10	2914/28 2918/6	2900/17 2900/22
	2925/28 2947/27	2900/27 2902/8
unique [1] 2925/21	usage [1] 2941/24	2902/12 2903/19
unless [3] 2898/26		2904/5 2904/10

V	volunteers [1]	2924/23 2932/22
ventures [1]	2924/21	2932/26 2936/3
2909/10	vote [52] 2915/5	2943/5 2950/18
versus [2] 2896/10	2915/6 2915/8	2950/22 2964/24
2901/6	2943/17 2943/22	2968/14 2968/18
very [5] 2900/14	2946/22 2950/18	2968/24 2971/22
2900/20 2915/18	2951/3 2951/17	2971/26 2975/18
2945/14 2973/27	2951/18 2952/2	voters [19] 2916/9
victory [1] 2899/17	2952/8 2953/9	2923/7 2924/5
video [10] 2898/15	2955/23 2959/22	2924/7 2924/24
2901/27 2901/28	2962/16 2962/17	2929/12 2929/15
2902/14 2902/25	2963/13 2963/14	2929/21 2929/26
2903/19 2903/21	2963/16 2963/21	2944/11 2952/2
2903/23 2903/28	2963/22 2964/1	2958/5 2959/1
2904/3	2964/3 2964/22	2959/4 2973/7
videos [9] 2898/11	2964/24 2964/25	2973/17 2974/11
2898/13 2899/1	2965/1 2965/5	2974/23 2974/27
2899/4 2899/8	2965/6 2965/14	voters' [1] 2971/20
2899/12 2899/24	2965/15 2967/5	votes [50] 2950/23
2899/27 2901/11	2968/8 2969/17	2950/23 2950/25
	2969/18 2969/27	2951/1 2951/2
Village [8] 2953/21 2953/28 2955/9	2970/3 2970/19	2951/4 2951/14
2955/15 2956/3	2971/2 2972/9	2951/19 2951/21
	2972/13 2972/15	2951/22 2951/26
2956/6 2956/13	2972/23 2973/7	2952/4 2952/10
2956/14	2973/24 2973/28	2953/1 2953/3
vitiate [2] 2908/21	2974/1 2974/8	2953/4 2953/11
2908/22	2975/17 2975/19	2953/13 2956/17
voice [1] 2915/27	2975/24	2959/12 2959/14
volume [3] 2902/12	voted [3] 2948/17	2959/19 2959/28
2903/19 2904/6	2948/19 2975/21	2960/5 2960/21
voluntarily [1]	voter [15] 2916/8	2960/27 2961/8
2953/17		

$ \mathbf{V} $	2975/28	2902/13 2902/16
votes [23]	wanted [4] 2899/25	2904/5 2904/6
2962/27 2962/27	2968/18 2968/18	we're [16] 2898/22
2963/3 2963/5	2968/21	2898/25 2898/27
2963/6 2963/24	wants [4] 2901/23	2899/16 2899/18
2964/4 2964/15	2910/14 2910/17	2903/21 2904/2
2965/2 2965/8	2938/13	2904/11 2905/5
2965/9 2968/15	was [105]	2906/5 2906/6
2968/16 2968/19	wasn't [4] 2901/26	2910/25 2913/8
2968/21 2968/22	2937/8 2946/26	2931/27 2949/19
2972/4 2972/5	2954/7	2961/28
2972/13 2972/22	waste [4] 2902/13	we've [11] 2898/28
2973/14 2973/18	2902/22 2903/25	2905/26 2910/11
2975/9	2903/26	2921/11 2921/20
voting [110]	wasted [6] 2900/10	2925/25 2934/25
	2902/28 2903/2	2941/18 2949/1
$ \mathbf{W} $	2972/15 2972/23	2950/9 2960/12
wait [2] 2903/11	2975/20	web [1] 2947/10
2914/2	way [10] 2915/27	weekend [1]
waived [1] 2899/21	2924/8 2946/23	2900/15
waiver [1] 2905/4	2947/4 2951/26	weighing [2]
walk [3] 2897/27	2967/25 2968/15	2918/3 2924/18
2924/20 2924/21	2972/4 2973/13	well [27] 2899/10
want [18] 2898/25	2974/14	2901/20 2901/25
2899/9 2900/27	ways [3] 2948/26	2902/3 2902/20
2902/12 2902/14	2968/6 2972/5	2906/28 2907/2
2904/9 2904/15	we [115]	2907/22 2908/2
2911/24 2913/7	we'd [2] 2898/11	2908/7 2908/10
2940/15 2950/28	2898/12	2908/21 2910/6
2952/22 2954/17	we'll [9] 2898/27	2925/18 2926/2
2954/28 2961/26	2900/11 2902/6	2927/2 2930/15
2971/3 2973/20	2902/10 2902/13	2931/14 2931/24

2911/1 2912/10 2914/15 2914/19 2914/23 2914/24 2921/15 2921/15 2921/16 2921/16 2924/27 2926/4 2926/6 2929/5 2929/13 2929/15 2929/16 2929/19 2929/27 2931/5 2931/5 2932/28 2955/18 2955/27 2956/6 2956/11 2956/21 2956/22 2958/15 2958/22 2966/26 2968/14 weren't [2] 2899/11 2901/27  2915/1 2915/21 2913/10 2922/13 2922/20 2925/9 2922/20 2925/9 2925/11 2925/23 2925/16 2936/17 2925/16 2936/17 2935/16 2936/17 2935/16 2936/17 2935/16 2936/17 2936/27 2945/27 2949/2 2954/4 2966/13 2969/19 2964/24 2965/5 2971/17 which [25] 2899/5 2898/19 2900/27 2906/17 2906/22 2923/4 2923/5 2927/3 2935/1 2901/27 2926/15 2930/9 2938/6 2938/8	Well [8] 2934/19 2948/13 2951/9 2954/26 2957/24 2969/3 2972/9 2973/26 went [1] 2898/7 were [45] 2898/10 2898/14 2898/16 2898/17 2899/12 2899/13 2900/21 2901/11 2901/26 2901/28 2903/17 2904/19 2905/22 2911/1 2012/10	WEST [2] 1/21 1/23 what [120] what's [8] 2898/17 2910/8 2926/24 2936/16 2951/16 2952/14 2957/6 2971/6 whatever [5] 2899/8 2904/9 2908/5 2912/2 2951/7 when [23] 2899/13 2905/21 2907/14 2911/7 2914/14	2938/11 2938/14 2939/17 2949/20 2958/4 2958/22 2959/27 2966/20 2969/13 whether [35] 2901/1 2905/12 2906/1 2906/2 2906/10 2906/17 2906/18 2906/24 2907/12 2907/19 2909/6 2910/17 2910/21 2910/28 2911/6 2911/9 2912/1 2913/10
2938/6 2938/8   2931/22 2934/25	2914/23 2914/24 2921/15 2921/15 2921/16 2921/16 2924/27 2926/4 2926/6 2929/5 2929/13 2929/15 2929/16 2929/19 2929/27 2931/5 2931/5 2932/28 2955/18 2955/27 2956/6 2956/11 2956/21 2956/22 2958/15 2958/22 2966/26 2968/14	2915/1 2915/21 2915/23 2916/2 2931/4 2933/10 2933/12 2933/13 2935/27 2951/25 2960/1 2960/5 2962/25 2963/2 2964/22 2964/23 2964/24 2965/5 where [24] 2898/6 2898/19 2900/27 2902/26 2909/4 2923/4 2923/5 2927/3 2935/1 2935/14 2936/23 2937/8 2937/9	2913/10 2922/13 2922/20 2925/9 2925/11 2925/23 2935/16 2936/17 2936/27 2945/27 2949/2 2954/4 2960/14 2961/25 2966/13 2969/19 2971/17 which [25] 2899/5 2899/12 2899/14 2906/17 2906/22 2909/5 2912/13 2912/14 2912/25 2917/21 2920/11 2926/15 2930/9

$\mathbf{W}$	whom [1] 2905/21	2950/20 2951/6
which [10]	whose [1] 2973/17	2951/9 2951/15
2935/20 2936/28	why [8] 2899/14	2951/20 2951/23
2938/7 2942/14	2902/25 2915/2	2952/4 2952/7
2949/19 2956/26	2936/7 2937/1	2953/12 2956/18
2963/5 2963/5	2961/27 2964/11	2956/27 2959/24
2966/5 2973/14	2975/16	2959/25 2960/2
while [1] 2900/17	wide [7] 2916/9	2960/9 2960/23
white [14] 2943/8	2923/28 2924/4	2960/26 2963/4
2943/15 2943/28	2924/27 2946/28	2963/21 2964/23
2944/6 2944/15	2965/18 2966/27	2969/26 2970/3
2944/16 2948/16	WIGHT [1] 1/17	2972/2 2972/3
2949/12 2961/22	will [26] 2899/7	2972/16 2972/19
2962/27 2964/3	2899/27 2900/24	2973/8 2973/22
2974/23 2974/27	2902/8 2915/14	2973/28
2975/8	2917/22 2917/24	winning [2]
who [19] 2900/2	2918/11 2925/12	2945/15 2962/20
2905/19 2906/7	2936/28 2942/27	wins [7] 2953/4
2906/23 2907/14	2947/3 2950/19	2962/21 2963/26
2907/19 2909/18	2951/23 2952/23	2972/9 2972/13
2912/10 2924/21	2952/24 2959/24	2972/28 2974/5
2929/13 2932/28	2959/25 2963/20	wish [1] 2901/22
2933/1 2955/22	2963/20 2963/25	wished [1] 2968/16
2959/1 2959/21	2965/3 2965/15	wishes [1] 2950/24
2972/20 2972/25	2972/20 2973/8	withdraw [1]
2972/20 2972/23	2975/6	2931/12
whole [4] 2929/19	willing [5] 2898/26	within [10] 2899/7
2944/24 2945/10	2898/27 2910/19	2939/1 2940/16
2950/11	2910/23 2924/21	2941/12 2941/28
wholly [4] 2948/3	win [34] 2900/23	2945/21 2948/3
2948/3 2948/5	2923/28 2944/8	2948/4 2948/5
2948/6	2944/16 2948/27	2948/6
2/TU/U		

$\mathbf{W}$	2950/10	2926/13 2930/2
without [3]	worked [2] 2967/2	2930/13 2931/14
2897/28 2943/20	2967/3	2931/23 2934/19
2945/13	works [8] 2949/17	2935/15 2936/18
witness [11] 2900/1	2958/4 2962/28	2938/4 2938/12
2901/23 2903/9	2964/11 2964/21	2942/25 2942/28
2903/17 2928/18	2973/2 2974/9	2943/14 2944/7
2928/19 2930/16	2975/1	2944/8 2944/9
2935/27 2941/19	worry [2] 2916/9	2944/10 2944/13
2942/8 2954/23	2971/22	2944/16 2945/11
witnesses [3] 3/3	worst [4] 2951/27	2945/14 2946/24
2903/8 2926/19	2952/9 2953/2	2948/26 2949/3
won [4] 2933/17	2963/2	2949/6 2949/21
2935/23 2946/24	worst-case [4]	2950/10 2950/11
2946/27	2951/27 2952/9	2955/5 2956/24
won't [4] 2902/13	2953/2 2963/2	2956/25 2958/19
2902/20 2962/27	worth [1] 2903/27	2958/20 2960/14
2963/21	would [84] 2897/13	2960/19 2961/6
wonder [1] 2940/11	2898/6 2898/7	2961/7 2961/16
wondering [1]	2898/10 2899/22	2961/16 2962/10
2974/22	2899/23 2899/28	2962/11 2964/3
Woodburn [1]	2900/9 2901/1	2964/7 2964/18
2968/22	2903/27 2904/17	2968/19 2968/26
work [18] 2900/6	2905/26 2906/8	2969/20 2969/24
2903/6 2905/25	2906/12 2907/1	2969/26 2970/3
2906/2 2906/11	2907/6 2908/27	2971/7 2974/1
2906/14 2906/18	2909/7 2909/9	2974/1 2975/20
2908/13 2909/7	2909/12 2909/27	2975/21
2910/5 2912/24	2909/28 2910/18	wouldn't [5]
2912/25 2912/26	2912/28 2913/9	2899/13 2901/13
2913/1 2913/13	2915/28 2924/3	2908/11 2943/20
2918/11 2947/17	2924/27 2925/24	2943/21

$\mathbf{W}$	2921/5 2921/10	2913/28 2924/14
write [2] 2949/21	2921/10 2926/8	2928/18 2928/22
2949/24	2926/17 2932/10	2936/9 2949/24
writes [1] 2958/9	2937/7 2937/17	2951/15 2955/14
written [1] 2904/22	2937/22 2937/25	2963/5 2964/2
wrong [8] 2951/28	2938/23 2939/10	2965/8 2965/9
2959/26 2959/26	2941/3 2944/21	you've [3] 2922/22
2959/28 2960/10	2947/10 2947/15	2949/11 2961/22
2960/20 2969/25	2949/5 2949/16	your [113]
2973/6	2949/26 2949/27	YVETTE [3] 1/3
	2950/2 2952/24	2896/4 2977/3
$\mathbf{Y}$	2953/27 2956/12	$\overline{\mathbf{Z}}$
yeah [6] 2903/7	2956/16 2957/5	
2903/24 2908/15	2959/10 2959/20	zone [2] 2941/12
2917/14 2929/18	2959/23 2961/10	2941/28
2945/11	2963/2 2964/6	
year [4] 2918/6	2967/25 2969/5	
2966/4 2968/11	2969/12 2970/17	
2968/12	2970/20 2970/23	
years [8] 2923/18	2971/5 2976/8	
2923/19 2939/12	yesterday [1]	
2940/20 2944/28	2898/15	
2950/17 2956/22	yet [1] 2897/15	
2956/23	you [221]	
yellow [1] 2920/15	you'd [2] 2949/11	
yes [53] 2898/4	2952/20	
2911/4 2911/18	you'll [9] 2898/2	
2911/26 2913/5	2920/15 2920/18	
2913/21 2913/22	2920/20 2924/23	
2914/21 2914/26	2934/28 2957/15	
2917/20 2918/18	2959/15 2960/2	
2920/23 2920/27	you're [13] 2901/18	